This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 06740410 7

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LIT...

6643

JOURNAL.

EDITED BY DAVID N. LORD.

VOL. VI.

JULY, 1853—APRIL, 1854.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY FRANKLIN KNIGHT,
140 NASSAU STREET.

1854.

ENTERED according to Act of Congress in the year 1854, by
DAVID N. LORD,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court for the Southern District of New York.

ROBERT CRAIGHEAD, PRINTER,
82 VESEY STREET.

358
106

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME VI. JULY, 1853. NUMBER I.

ART. I.—DR. J. P. SMITH ON THE GEOLOGICAL THEORY.

BY THE EDITOR.

HAVING pointed out in a former article the error of Dr. Smith's view of the origin of the earth, we shall now show the fallacy of "the principle" on which he persuaded himself the sacred text is reconcilable with it. In order that it may be clearly seen, what it is which he thus proposes to accomplish, we will state the chief antagonistic points he is to bring into harmony.

I. The Bible represents that the heaven and earth were brought into existence on the first of the six days of the creation recorded in Genesis. That is the plain grammatical sense of Genesis i. 1, 2: and it is directly declared, Exodus xx. 11, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is;" and again Ex. xxxi. 17.

The geological theory denies that they were created at that epoch, and asserts that they had their origin at a date innumerable ages earlier.

II. The sacred history represents that the earth when created was waste and unfurnished, covered with an ocean and wrapped in absolute darkness.

Dr. Smith denies that it was created in that state; and maintains that instead, it first subsisted in the form either of gas or fusion from intense heat, or at least, immediately

passed into one of those forms, and avers that the passage, Gen. i. 2, relates not to the earth at large, but only to a small portion of its surface lying between the Caucasian ridge and the Indian and Persian gulfs; and at a date myriads and millions of years posterior to its creation.

III. The sacred history teaches that light was created on the first day, and that it was the light of the sun; as the period of the earth's revolution on its axis was divided by it into night and day.

Dr. Smith denies that either the sun or light was created on that occasion, and exhibits the effect then produced, as simply, that "the atmosphere over the region" south of the Caucasian range "became so far cleared" of some cause of darkness, "as to be pervious to light, though not yet perfectly transparent," and that light accordingly was not at all the subject of the divine fiat, but instead a mist, smoke, cloud, or some other element diffused through the spaces above "the region" that intercepted the sun's rays.—P. 174.

IV. The inspired narrative teaches that God created the firmament or atmosphere on the second day, and raised thereby a portion of the waters from the ocean into the space above.

Dr. Smith denies that the atmosphere was then created, and holds, that the effect then produced was simply that "the watery vapour collected into floating masses,—the clouds," and that it was the consequence, therefore, not of a divine interposition, but of the ordinary agents by which the waters of the ocean are absorbed by the atmosphere and formed into clouds.

V. The sacred history states that the waters that had before everywhere enveloped the globe were on the third day first collected into seas, and dry land made to appear.

Dr. Smith denies that the first collection of the waters into distinct bodies and seas, and formation of dry land, took place at that epoch. He maintains that the waters which were gathered together on the third day, were themselves a sea surrounded by high ranges of mountains on the east, west, and north; and the movement to which they were then subjected was nothing more than their being forced back, by the elevation of the region over which they were spread, into the Persian and Indian seas; and that seas and dry lands, mountains and continents, had existed through innumerable ages before.

VI. The history in Genesis represents that God, on the fourth day, established the sun and moon in that relation to the earth by which they determine the succession of days, seasons, and years.

Dr. Smith denies that any change was wrought in their relations at that epoch; and maintains that the only effect that then took place, was such a purification of the atmosphere from mists, clouds, or some other element that had intercepted their rays, that their light reached the earth without obstruction and illuminated its surface. "By the fourth day," he says, "the atmosphere over this district,"—lying south of the Caucasian ridge,—"had become pellucid; and had there been a human eye to have beheld, the brightness of the sun would have been seen, and the other heavenly bodies after the sun was set."—P. 235.

VII. The narrative in Genesis states that vegetables were first created on the third day, and animals on the fifth and sixth, and that is the representation, Exodus xx. 11, in which it is declared that not only the heaven, earth, and sea were created in six days, but also, all that in them is.

Dr. Smith affirms that the earth had previously been stocked with vegetables and animals of different orders, and that they had flourished in their several spheres through an incalculable round of years.

The two representations are thus in open variance with each other in respect to every particular. They not only disagree in respect to the date of the creation of the heavens and earth, the first formation of seas and dry land, and the first creation of vegetables and animals, but they differ also in the utmost degree in regard to the subjects and nature of several of the events themselves. According to the Scriptural account, all the divine acts of the six days were omnipotent and creative: according to Dr. Smith, none of them were, except those by which vegetables and animals were formed. All the rest were mere acts of ordinary providence, and the effects that were wrought, the effects of second causes. If then the theory is, as he holds, indisputably correct, the question whether the sacred history can be legitimately made to harmonize with it, is of infinite moment. It is nothing less than the question whether the theory convicts the Bible of an error so palpable and enormous as must justly divest

it of all title to be received as a divine revelation. To determine that question favorably to the authority of the Scriptures, their conciliation with the theory must be made on principles that are unquestionably just, and that are so clear and certain as to be entitled to produce conviction in every intelligent and candid mind. Conjectures, assertions, assumptions, forced constructions, or any other artifices, will not meet the exigency. The Scriptures must be demonstrated to be in absolute harmony with the theory, by the most natural, ample, and irrefragable evidence, or a sum of falsehood is proved to exist in them so stupendous, and so senseless, as to strip them of all claim to be regarded as the word of God. That many believe them to be wholly irreconcilable and are led by the theory into infidelity, he admits:—

"It is incumbent on us to be aware that a vague idea has obtained circulation, that certain geological doctrines are at variance with the Holy Scriptures. *This notion works with pernicious effect. The semblance of discrepancy is indeed undeniable*, but I profess my conviction that it is nothing but a semblance, and that like many other difficulties on all important subjects that have tried the intellect of man, it vanishes before careful and sincere examination. *The naked fact*, however, the mere appearance, is eagerly laid hold of by some irreligious men, and is made an excuse for dismissing from their minds any serious regard to *the law and gospel of God* and any rational investigation of *the evidences of revelation*, for they are very willing to assume that Christianity is either a mass of absolute prejudices, or a theory so laboring under heavy suspicion as to have but slender claims upon a philosopher's attention. On the opposite extreme, many excellent persons, devout and practical Christians, knowing that the word of our God shall stand for ever, feel no desire to become acquainted with the real merits of the question; and sit down with a persuasion that geological theories are visionary plausibilities, each having its day of fashion, then being exploded in favor of some other vagary, which in its turn gives way, and all falling under the description of false philosophy and vain deceit. . .

"That such a state of opinion is injurious to the cause of Christianity can admit of no doubt. *It is a fearful thing to array science and religion against each other*, for, however unnatural and unjust this antagonist position certainly is, the fact of its existence is pregnant with evil on both sides.—Pp. 20, 21.

"We have seen that this science brings us into a situation that we cannot but feel most unwelcome and even distressing. *In these lec-*

tures it has been sufficiently shown that some of the most evident geological facts carry the APPEARANCE OF BEING AT VARIANCE *with the declarations of Holy Scripture;* and that many of our friends, men of ardent piety and Christian excellence, not perceiving any mode of conciliation, deny and reject, with great vehemence, our statement of those facts."—P. 268.

He thus admits that the theory is in appearance in open contradiction to the sacred record; that they are regarded by many eminent Christians as wholly irreconcilable with each other; and that that is so fully the belief of numbers of the irreligious, that receiving the theory as true, they wholly reject the Scriptures. He maintains, too, that if the Scriptures are the word of God they must be shown to be in perfect harmony with the theory. He says, in reference to his views in regard to the deluge:—

"I cannot doubt but that some alarm and anxiety may be produced in the minds of many by the hearing of these statements. *They will be thought to be in direct contradiction to the sacred narrative; and we cannot justify to ourselves any twisting and wresting of that narrative in order to bring it into an apparent accordance with the doctrines of human philosophy.* But let my friends dismiss their fears. *The Author of nature and the Author of revelation is the same. He cannot be at variance with himself. The book of his works and the book of his word cannot be contradictory.* On the one hand, we find certain appearances in the kingdoms of nature, which stand upon various and independent grounds of sensible proof; and on the other hand, *are declarations of Scripture which seem to be irreconcilable with those appearances*, which are indeed ascertained facts. But we are sure that TRUTH is immutable; and that one truth can never contradict another. Different parts of its vast empire may and do lie far asunder, and the intermediate portions may be covered with more or less of obscurity; but they are under the same sceptre; and it is of itself and antecedently certain that the facts of nature and the laws that govern them, are in perfect unison with every other part of the will of Him that made them." —P. 246.

He was thus perfectly aware of the antagonism of his theory to the Scriptures; and that on his views, unless they can be fairly and fully reconciled, it is the Bible, not the theory, that is convicted of fatal error. What now is the "principle" on which he professes to effect their conciliation, and what

adequacy has it to that object? We answer: It is no principle whatever, and has no adaptation to the end for which he employs it. So far from it, it directly confutes his pretences, and sanctions the common construction of the record in Genesis, as teaching that the heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, were created in the six days of that narrative. For what he denominates his "principle" of interpretation, stript of the cloud of words and senseless pretences in which it is wrapped up, is nothing else than this: First that God "condescendingly" employed in that history of the creation, *a method adapted to the nature and especially the conceptions of men;* which means, if it means anything, that it was eminently adapted to give them true views of the facts he professed to reveal to them, and preserve them from misconception; from which it follows accordingly, that the time and mode of the creation were precisely what that narrative, taken in its plain grammatical sense, represents them to have been; and thence, that the geological theory which contradicts it, is wholly groundless and false.

And next.—That God often assumed a human form in revealing himself to the patriarchs and prophets; and used in his communications to them, such figures of speech as men are accustomed to employ in expressing their thoughts to one another:—from which it follows again that they are to be interpreted, as such figures usually are; and thence that if any of them occur in the history of the creation, the sense conveyed in the expression in which they are employed, is precisely that which men ordinarily and naturally assign to them; and consequently, that the geological theory which contradicts that sense, is false. He states the first branch of his "principle" in the following manner:—

"The earliest revelations which God was pleased to grant to man, whether in the state of pristine integrity, or in that into which by transgression he fell, must have been conveyed by representations, . . . composed of materials derived from the *knowledge* possessed by the subjects of those revelations, and the *relations* under which they stood to beings and circumstances around them.

"This position is only the correlate of saying that the revelation must have been given, and transmitted in *the language spoken or written by those to whom the message of God came;* or, to say all in one word, it must have been *intelligible.*"—P. 204.

The nouns, verbs, adjectives, and other words employed, then, in the history of the creation in Genesis and Exodus, must, by this, have been used by the Most High in precisely the sense in which they were employed by the Israelites of the age of Moses, to whom that history was communicated. But the Israelites of that age to whom that revelation was made, used all these terms in as specific and definite a sense as is now assigned to them in our language. Thus they used the term answering to our noun earth, to denote this world, precisely as we do. Whether they regarded it as a sphere revolving on its axis, or as an extended plane that is stationary, does not touch that fact, nor at all affect the question in debate. They, in like manner, used the words answering to our heaven, sun, moon, stars, waters, darkness, light, evening, morning, night, day, seas, dry land, herbs, trees, fish, fowl, and beasts, to designate identically the same objects; and the verbs answering to create, make, and form, to denote precisely the same acts, as we now employ these verbs to denote. Of this there can be no dispute. That they entertained different ideas of the nature of the firmament, the distances and magnitudes of the heavenly bodies, and the reason of the succession of day and night, does not touch this fact at all. Of the objects that were called into existence and the modifications that were wrought in them by the creative acts, the language of Genesis conveyed identically the same views to them as it conveys to us. And the declaration accordingly, in the fourth commandment, that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, was to them as direct and specific a declaration as language could express, that the whole of the creative work detailed in Genesis, was wrought in the six days of that record, and gave them, therefore, all the certainty that the divine testimony can yield, that the heaven and earth had no existence anterior to that epoch. Dr. Smith's boasted "principle" by which he is to empty the narrative of its natural sense, and bring it into harmony with his theory, thus, instead of answering, defeats his object, and verifies the construction which he attempts to set aside by it. If God condescended to use the terms in which the history of the creation is given in the sense in which they were customarily employed by the Israelites to whom Moses delivered that history, as he

undoubtedly did; then he unquestionably teaches in it that the heavens and earth were called into existence, and the whole creative work recorded there, performed by him in the week in which man received his being; and contradicts the geological theory, therefore, that the creation of the heavens and earth took place innumerable ages before.

Is it not astounding that this was not seen by Dr. Smith; that he did not perceive that his object required him to show precisely the converse of his "principle;" that instead of representing the Most High as accommodating himself to the conceptions of the Israelites, and using the language he employed in the sense in which they were accustomed to use it, so that they would naturally contemplate his creative acts and the effects to which he gave existence, according to their real nature, he should have shown that he pursued precisely the opposite course, and employed the terms of the narrative in a sense wholly novel and extraordinary, and that brings the propositions it expresses into harmony with the teachings of the geological theory? No pretext, however, of that kind is made by Dr. Smith; nor does he give any proof directly that the ignorance of the Israelites of the structure of the solar system, or their false notions of the earth and heavens, presented any obstacle to God's making known to them, had he desired so to do, and in terms they would have fully understood, that the heavens and earth were created at a date far earlier than the epoch of the six days of Genesis, and that our world had in the mean time been the scene of vegetable and animal life. There is nothing in these statements which the Israelites were not as capable of comprehending as easily and fully as they understood the announcement which the Most High made to them at Sinai, that he created the heavens and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, in the six days of the Mosaic epoch. The assumption on which Dr. Smith in reality builds his attempt to reconcile the history in Genesis with his theory, that those elements of his system transcended the understanding of the Hebrews, and that God was obliged, in order to bring the revelation he was to make within the sphere of their comprehension, to omit those particulars, and substitute a representation that is in antagonism with them, is thus not only altogether groundless; it is self-contradictory; for what can form a

grosser self-contradiction, than the representation that God, in condescending to use a method of describing the creation of the world, which the Israelites would naturally understand as denoting what he meant to express by it, yet employed a method which they infallibly understood as signifying a wholly different work? It is indeed worse than self-contradictory. It is a bold and flagrant impeachment of the wisdom and truth of the Most High, under the pretext of honoring his attributes and vindicating the veracity and authority of his word! A pitiable issue truly of the bustling and pompous parade he makes with his "principle;"—a wretched termination of the ostentatious protestations he utters at every turn of his lofty sense of God's perfections and unquestioning trust in his word! Yet not a syllable is uttered by him to cover up this feature of his procedure. He makes no attempt to show *how* his "principle" works the effect he ascribes to it, in respect to any one of the points on which the sacred narrative is at variance with his theory. He gives no indication in what way the declaration that God created the heavens and earth, the sea, and all that in them is in six days, is made by his "principle" to mean that he created the heavens and earth at an immeasurably earlier epoch. He gives no clue to the mode in which it makes the creation of light to mean a mere removal from the atmosphere of mist, or some other dense element that had intercepted the sun's rays. He says nothing of the way in which it makes the creation of the atmosphere to mean the mere collection in it of floating vapors and clouds. He offers no explanation of the process by which it makes the gathering of the waters into seas, to mean simply the removal of those that were spread over the "region" south of the Caucasus into the Persian and Indian gulfs; nor does he give any hint of the way in which it causes the first production of dry land, to indicate the elevation of a "region" into the atmosphere that had before existed as dry land, through an incalculable round of years. Of the application of his "principle" to these great particulars in which his theory contradicts the sacred history; of the way in which it works the extraordinary effects he ascribes to it, which it was his professed aim to explain and demonstrate, he utters not a word. His readers are left to be duped, if they will, by his loud protes-

tations of candor, his lofty pretensions to learning, and his bold assertions, into the belief that his principle works out the conciliation of the theory with the inspired history which he professes to achieve by it. Whether there was artifice in this, or whether he was the victim of the quackery he practised on others, we leave our readers to judge. Most persons who publicly undertake to effect the reconciliation of a scientific theory with a doctrine of the Scriptures, which it contradicts, and state the principle on which they are made to harmonize, would deem it requisite to their object to demonstrate the adequacy of the principle to the purpose by applying it, and showing that it actually brings the theory and doctrine out of their seeming antagonism into harmony. Dr. Smith avoids that test of his principle, and contents himself with airy pretences, bold assertions and assumptions, pompous self-congratulations at the success of his expedient, and gibes and sneers at those whose ignorance and dulness had withheld them from seeing what he affects to see, and with a few dashes of his pen makes so plain.

He next proceeds to the second branch of his principle; namely that God often assumed a human form in his theophanies to the patriarchs and prophets, and used in his communications to them such figures of speech as men are accustomed to employ in expressing their thoughts to one another. He says:—

"We are thus led to another observation, which will bring us to the *principle* proposed as the solution of the Biblical question, with relation not to geology only, but to human science universally. It is this.

"The revelations successively given to the fathers of mankind, to the ancestors of the Israelitish nation, and to particular persons of that nation, at sundry times, and in diverse manners, were conveyed *in representations to the senses*, chiefly that of *sight*, and in *words descriptive* of those representations.

"It was adapted to a state of intellectual and spiritual infancy; and from it was derived *that character* of the Old Testament revelations, which it is our present object to consider more closely.

"That character consisted in representing God by the *figurative* attribution of the human form with its organs and functions, and the human mind with its affections and passions."—Pp. 205–207.

But this not only does not accomplish what he proposes to

effect by it, but it has no bearing whatever on the subject. How does the fact that God assumed a human form, and is represented as having eyes, hands, and a mouth, and as uttering words, show that the geological theory that he created the heavens and earth infinite ages since, is in perfect harmony with his declaration in the fourth commandment, that he created them on the first day of the Mosaic epoch, which was but about six thousand years ago? How is the theory that vegetables and animals existed and flourished on the earth in infinite numbers, through incalculable periods anterior to the creation recorded in Genesis, reconciled by it with that inspired record, which represents that they were first brought into existence on the third, fifth, and sixth days of that epoch? It is preposterous to pretend that it works any change in the relations of those contradictory propositions to each other. No one can seriously urge it, who is not either laboring under extreme misconception, or endeavoring, at all hazards, to mystify and mislead others.

He adduces also the mode in which the Scriptures exhibit the great objects and processes of the physical world, as exemplifying his "principle."

"We have now to consider the manner in which this characteristic style of the Scriptures speaks of *natural phenomena*. With regard to the figure of the earth, its relation to the heavenly bodies, and its motion or immobility; so far as I have been able to ascertain, direct information does not occur in the Scriptures upon these subjects. But there are many passages which, in the way of incidental mention, seem capable of affording us abundant satisfaction. As this is a topic of much interest in itself, and has a close connexion with our ultimate object, I shall recite passages at some length."—P. 214.

He quotes accordingly a number of passages in which figurative expressions are employed to denote the appearances and seeming conditions of the heavens and earth; none of which, however, have any bearing on the point he affects to establish by them. His first is Job xxvi. 7. "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." P. 215. Here the verb "stretcheth" is used by a metaphor to denote that the heavens appeared to the eye *as though they were stretched out* like a

vast dome or expanse; not that they were actually formed by such a process; and the verb "hangeth" is employed by the same figure to signify that the *earth* seems to be sustained in its position, as though it were suspended from some fixed object above; not that it really is upheld in that manner. To treat the verbs as used literally, is to defeat the very object for which the metaphors are employed, and this Dr. Smith in effect admits. He says:—

"The former part of this verse *seems* to contemplate the expanse of the starry heavens as seen by night, especially distinguishing the northern constellations, and presenting *the appearance of a concave surface, extended on all sides;* or as it is more fully expressed in Isaiah, 'he stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in.' By 'the empty place' appears to be meant the whole space *above the habitable ground* [a singular error; it means undoubtedly the seeming empty space beneath the northern arch of the sky, in which the stars of that part of the heavens appear to be fixed], and which, by those *who had no knowledge of the atmosphere* or any other aeriform substance, was regarded as emptiness, a mere nothing. [A still more extraordinary fancy. He might as well assume that the ancients had no knowledge of light, colors, heat, or the matter of the earth itself. The fact that they were not aware of the constitution of the atmosphere, is no more a proof that they were not aware of its existence, than their ignorance of the mode in which colors are produced, external objects perceived by an image on the retina, or minerals and rocks formed by crystallization, is a proof that they knew nothing of minerals, the forms of external objects, or colors.] The suspending the earth upon nothing, comes as the antithesis of the former member, and declares that the solid earth on which men and other creatures dwell, has no *visible or known support*, but remains in its place fixed by the decree and power of God."—P. 215.

What bearing then has the passage on the point at issue? It is employed simply, he admits, in describing certain appearances or conditions of the heavens and earth, as they seem to the eye; and the descriptive terms are used by a metaphor, the express office of which is to depict *resemblances* in contra-distinction from literalities. The figures themselves therefore preclude the literal sense which he, by a strange self-contradiction, attempts to fasten on them.

Besides, there is no reference whatever in the passage to the time when the heavens and earth were brought into existence. There is nothing that can by any pretext be made to imply that their creation took place at an earlier date than that which is assigned to it by the record in Genesis. What then does it contribute towards the reconciliation of that record with the geological theory? How does the use of those metaphors in describing certain appearances of the heavens and earth, two thousand five hundred years perhaps after the epoch of the six days, show that the inspired history of their creation at that epoch is in perfect consistence with the theory that their creation took place at a date infinite ages earlier? What but the most extraordinary infatuation can have led Dr. Smith to fancy that it achieves that impossible effect?

He quotes a number of other passages in which metaphors, drawn from architecture, are used, that exhibit the earth as having a foundation and a corner-stone, and as sustained upon pillars; and other similar figures are employed in the description of other natural objects. They are used, however, for the express purpose of depicting mere resemblances, not to describe realities. When the mother of Samuel said, "The pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and he hath set the world upon them," no one supposes she expressed a belief that the earth is really set on pillars, any more than when she said, "Neither is there any rock like our God," she used that expression because she regarded Jehovah as a real rock: nor when Job said, "The pillars of heaven tremble, and are astonished at his reproof," does any one suppose he used the expression because he truly thought the arch of heaven was upheld by bronze or marble columns, any more than he used the word astonished, because he believed the earth really felt astonishment, or was actually rebuked by the Almighty. It bespeaks the most extraordinary inacquaintance with the usage of language, that these and similar figures should be taken as having their origin in the cosmogony of the ancient Hebrews. They are used as frequently in modern poetry, oratory, and ordinary speech, as they were by the Israelites three thousand years ago; and are as consistent with the views that are now

entertained of the structure of the universe, as they are with the notions held by that people in that age. But they have not in either case the remotest bearing on the point which Dr. Smith professes to determine by them. What has the question whether the Hebrews thought the earth an extended plane, and believed it supported by pillars, to do with the question whether the theory that the earth was called into existence many millions of ages ago, is consistent with the Scriptural history that it was created about six thousand years since? What power or adaptation has it to show that those antagonistic propositions are not contradictions, but, differing as they do, are yet both true, and in perfect harmony? Can any man in his senses persuade himself it can achieve such a palpable impossibility? The earth is said to reel to and fro, and stagger like a drunken man, and to have spued out the nations of Canaan from their land. Did Dr. Smith suppose these metaphorical expressions indicate that such notions were really entertained by the Hebrews of the structure and motions of the earth, and that they prove that his theory of its age is in harmony with the history in Genesis of its creation? He might undoubtedly as well have alleged them for that purpose as those which he quotes. When the Psalmist said, "If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there thy hand shall lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me," did Dr. Smith suppose he really thought the morning has wings, and that he could take them, if he chose, and fly to the western end of the Mediterranean? Why not, if he imagined the metaphorical ascription to the earth and heaven of pillars, shows that the Hebrews believed they are really upheld by such a support? And why did he not allege the one as readily as the other, in proof that passages which he holds exhibit the earth as created at two epochs, separated from each other by unknown and immeasurable periods, are nevertheless consistent with the fact that it was created at but one of them? Yet he winds up his pretence of proving his point with the following self-congratulatory announcement:—

"The length to which these observations have gone appeared necessary, in order to *establish the broad and strong foundation* of that

principle of Biblical interpretation, which, to my full conviction, will liberate us from difficulty, in relation to the supposed discrepancies between the facts of science, especially geological science, and the testimony of the Holy Scriptures."—P. 221.

Such is the wretched farce he presents under the pretext of stating and exemplifying a "principle" that reconciles his theory of the age of the earth with the date ascribed to it by the Scriptures, though not a hint is uttered by him of the mode in which these and other similar metaphorical expressions change the meaning of the language of the history in Genesis i.;—in which no metaphor, except in the use of the word *rule*, and no comparison whatever, or any other rhetorical figure occurs;—and reduces it to a consistency with the geological theory. Though, in fact, no rule of interpretation is stated by him, he yet seems not to have suspected that his imagined "principle" does not perfectly reconcile his theory with the testimony of the Scriptures. Like the maniac who, flattering himself he had discovered a principle of perpetual motion, continued to cherish the delusion, though unable to construct an engine that answered to his idea, or to show how, if erected, it was to perpetuate its activity,—Dr. Smith continued, it would seem, under the persuasion that his "principle" of interpretation achieved the task he assigned to it, though he made no application of it to the sacred text, nor gave any clue to the mode in which it was to work out the result which he persuaded himself he had accomplished by it.

Having thus announced his principle of interpretation, he at length proceeds professedly to give his construction by it of the history of the creation in Genesis, by which he was to bring that narrative into harmony with the doctrines of his theory. He in fact, however, makes no application of it whatever, nor presents the remotest intimation of the way in which it effects the object he represents it as accomplishing. Instead, the interpretation he gives is altogether independent of it, and based on different grounds; and is, in fact, nothing else than his mere arbitrary opinion or fancy, framed to meet the exigencies of the theory. This is sufficiently seen from his exposition of the two first verses.

Thus of the announcement, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth," he says:—

"The phrase 'the heavens and the earth,' though not always used by the sacred writers in the full sense, is the most comprehensive that the Hebrew language affords to designate *the universe* of dependent being; and, on account of the connexion, it requires to be so taken in this place. It thus corresponds to the expression in the New Testament, 'All things that are in the heavens and that are on the earth, the visible and the invisible; the all things.' This sublime sentence therefore stands at the head of the sacred volume, announcing that there was an epoch, a point in the flow of infinite duration, when *the whole of the dependent world*, or whatever portion of it first had existence, was *brought* into being. . . It was a *creation*, in the proper sense; not a modelling or new-forming. The phrase 'in the beginning' is used several times in Scripture, to denote the commencement of whatever flow of time or series of things the subject spoken of requires. . . Here the expression specifies an action as taking place at this point of time—an act of the infinite Being; but WHEN that beginning was, when that act was put forth, it was not the design of revelation to inform us. Carry it back as far as we may, there is *eternity* beyond it.

"In the same manner *we understand* the recapitulation in chap. ii. 1–3, the commencement of the briefer narrative in chap. ii. 4, and the reason of the Sabbath given in the fourth commandment, Exodus xx. 11. All that the Israelites would understand by the heavens and the earth, all that they knew, and all that it concerned them to know, was made (adjusted, arranged, appropriated to new purposes, for so the word often signifies), 'in six days.' There is just as much reason to interpret that commandment, as representing the Deity to 'faint and be weary,' in direct contradiction to other parts of the Bible, as to maintain that it teaches *the proper creation* of the universe to have taken place immediately before the institution of the Sabbath."—Pp. 227, 228.

His object in this is to show that the creation of the heavens and earth, announced Gen. i. 1, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," took place at a different epoch, and was in nature a wholly different work from that which is described in the remainder of the chapter, and is the subject of the declaration in the fourth commandment,—"In six days the Lord made the heavens and

earth, the sea, and all that in them is;" and in order to this, he first maintains that the work referred to in Gen. i. 2–31, and Exodus xx. 11, was "not a proper creation," but a mere re-arranging, or appropriating to a new purpose. He assumes, therefore, next, that the terms "the heavens and earth," Gen. i. 1, have a totally different meaning from that with which they are used, Gen. ii. 1–4, and Exodus xx. 11, and denote nothing, as we shall show, but the earth itself, with the vapors, clouds, or dust which he supposes surrounded it from the first to the fourth of the six days. And, thirdly, he assumes or implies that this results from figures with which the terms embodying the new sense are employed; and his achieving the result at which he aims depends on his establishing these points. If the phrase "the heavens and earth" have precisely the same meaning in Genesis ii. 1–4, and Exodus xx. 11, as it has in Genesis i. 1;—if the verb "made" in Exodus xx. 11, and "create" in Genesis ii. 1–4, have identically the same meaning as "create" has in Genesis i. 1; and if they are all used in their literal sense in these passages, then the explication by which he attempts to bring them into consistency with his geological theory, falls to the ground.

In the first place, then, his construction is left without any proof. He alleges nothing whatever to sustain it. Let the reader re-peruse the passage, and he will see that not a shadow of anything is adduced to support his representation, except what lies couched in the expressions, "we understand," "all that the Israelites could understand," "all that they knew, and all that it concerned them to know," which are nothing more than his mere dicta. He does not affect to sustain them by any evidence. He does not attempt to show how his "principle" determines their meaning to be that which he assigns to them. He does not state what figures he supposes there are in those passages to which he regards his "principle" as applicable. He does not even allude to his principle. The whole is completely independent of anything that he had before uttered, and rests on nothing whatever except his mere asseveration—a slender basis, truly, for the support of such a towering superstructure!

In the next place his assumption and assertion that the

word translated "made" in Exodus xx. 11, and the word "create," Genesis ii. 4, are used in a wholly different sense from "create," Gen. i. 1, and denote a mere adjustment or re-arrangement; and thence that the work described, Gen. i. 2–31, and denoted Exodus xx. 11, was not a "proper creation," is not only wholly arbitrary and groundless, but is unquestionably against the sense of these verbs in those passages, and their usage in all similar cases. The verb עשה, to make, translated made, Exodus xx. 11, when employed, as it often is, to denote the bringing of a thing into existence, has identically the sense of the verb create, when used to signify the calling of a thing into being from nothing; precisely as our verb make is used in that sense when employed to signify the production of a thing, which, from its nature, can only come into existence by creation. Thus, when God is said to be the maker of heaven and earth, the maker of the universe, and the maker of angels and men, the sense is identically the same as when he is said to be their creator. As the making of the heavens and earth, of intelligent beings, and all other creatures and things of life, must, of necessity, be by creation, the verb make is used as naturally and properly to express their being brought into existence in that manner as the verb create, and carries with it as necessarily and absolutely the sense of giving existence to that which before had no being. This equivalence of the terms, when employed to denote the origination of such existences, is exemplified in their usage in the history of the creation itself, Genesis i. and ii., in which they are repeatedly employed interchangeably to signify the production of things that are indisputably called into being from nothing. Thus, in the account of the creation of man, Genesis i. 26, 27,—"And God said, let us *make* man in our image, after our likeness. . . So God *created* man in his image, in the image of God *created* he him; male and female *created* he them," the verb translated make, indisputably has precisely the same sense as the verb create; as it is used to denote especially the calling into being of man's intelligent nature, in which his likeness to God consists. To assign to it the lower sense Dr. Smith ascribes to it, of merely rearranging a substance that was already in existence, or giving it a new shape, would be either to represent man as

altogether material, or else to ascribe to his spiritual nature a pre-existence, and exhibit the work of which he was then the subject, a mere modification of his being, instead of a creation. In like manner, in Genesis ii. 3, 4,—"And God blessed the seventh day, because that in it he had rested from all the work which God created and made." "These are the generations"—that is, the history of the origin—"of the heavens and of the earth *when* they were created in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field before it grew." Here the verb translated made is used as the exact equivalent of create, indisputably, as they are employed to signify the calling into existence of identically the same things,—"all the work which God created and made;" and the book of their genesis, or history of their origin, is declared to be their history *when* they were created; and that time is specified as the time when the herbs and plants were called into existence, which was on the third of the six days. The verb translated create, in each of these instances, is the same as that used Genesis i. 1, which, Dr. Smith admits, signifies "a proper creation, not a modelling or new-forming;" and the verb rendered "made" is in each instance also that which is used Exodus xx. 11, and is there rendered by the same term. We have thus the most ample certainty from the history of the creation itself, that the verb translated made in the annunciation, in the fourth commandment, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is," denotes "a proper creation," or gift of existence, in identically the sense in which the heavens and earth are, in Genesis i. 1, declared to have been created. The fact that the verb rendered made, is sometimes employed to signify the arrangement in a new combination of things that before existed, or gift to them of a new shape, is no proof that that is its sense in these passages, any more than the fact that the verb create is sometimes used to denote the production of effects without a proper creation; as in the expressions, "he created a great sensation," "he created an extraordinary stir," in which it simply denotes the excitement of a sensation and stir, is a proof that that is its sense in Genesis i. 1, 26, 27. As the nature of that to which it

is applied in the expression, "he created a sensation," shows that it is there used only in the sense of occasioning or exciting, so the nature of that to which the verb to make is applied, in Genesis i. 26, 27,—"And God said, let us make man in our image;" and Exodus xx. 11, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is," shows, with equal certainty, that the sense in which it is there used, is that of a proper and absolute creation. Dr. Smith's attempt to fasten on it, by his mere dictum, a wholly different and lower meaning, is thus not only without a shadow of authority, but against its clear and indisputable usage in the history of the creation, in Genesis, and its natural and necessary meaning when employed as it is, in Exodus xx. 11, to denote acts by which God is the maker of the heavens and the earth, and the sea, and the organized and living natures with which they are peopled.

In the third place, he is equally in error in his representation that the phrase "the heavens and earth," in Exodus xx. 11, and Genesis ii. 3, 4, is used in a different sense from that with which it is employed in Genesis i. 1, and denotes nothing but a small part of the earth and the vapors, or other dense elements, which he imagines enveloped it until the fourth of the six days. The clear demonstration of this point, which he rather assumes or implies, than formally asserts, is indispensable to the verification of his construction. He admits that the phrase, the heavens and the earth, Genesis i. 1, denotes the whole solar system, and all the other celestial orbs that were known to the Hebrews. He assumes, however, that in the fourth commandment, it has an altogether inferior sense, and signifies nothing but what he holds was the subject of the divine acts, recorded in the history of the six days' work, Genesis i. 2–31. And he exhibits that as a small part of the earth, merely, and its living forms, to the exclusion of the rest, and of the sun, moon, and all other celestial orbs. Thus, instead of the sun, or the sun's light, he maintains that the subject of the divine act, recorded Genesis i. 3, "And God said, let there be light, and there was light," was a mere vapor, or dense element, that enveloped a part of the earth; and that the effect wrought was the mere removal of that envelope, so that a measure of light penetrated to the earth's surface. "The

atmosphere," he says, "over the region became *so far cleared* as to be *pervious* to light, though not yet perfectly transparent."—P. 234. In like manner he maintains also, that, instead of a change in the relations of the sun and moon to the earth, by which they became the determiners of its days and seasons and years, described Genesis i. 14, the vapors of the atmosphere were the subject of the act there recorded, and that the effect wrought was their removal; so that the sun's light, and that of the other orbs, reached the earth without obstruction. "By the fourth day," he says, "the atmosphere over this district had become pellucid; and had there been a human eye to have beheld, the brightness of the sun would have been seen, and other heavenly bodies, after the sun was set."—P. 235. The sun, moon, planets, and stars were not then, according to him, the subjects of any of the acts of the six days, described Gen. i. 3–31, and Exodus xx. 11, and therefore the phrase the heavens and earth in Exodus xx. 11, and Genesis ii. 3, 4, is used in a sense wholly inferior to that with which it is employed in the announcement, Genesis i. 1, that in the beginning God created them; and signifies there, nothing more than a part of the earth itself, and its living forms. Of this extraordinary representation, on the proof of which the validity of his construction of the verb "made," Exodus xx. 11, depends, he offers not the slightest evidence, nor could he, had he attempted it. There is no instance in the sacred volume in which the phrase "the heavens and earth," does not denote at least the whole solar system of which the Hebrews had a knowledge, and it usually signifies the whole of the worlds with which they were acquainted. This Dr. Smith himself states as its meaning. He says of Genesis i. 1, "the phrase 'the heavens and the earth,' though not always used by the sacred writers in the full sense, is *the most comprehensive that the Hebrew language affords to designate the universe of dependent being*, [with which the Hebrews were acquainted,] and, *on account of its connexion*, it requires to be so taken in this place. It thus corresponds to the expressions in the New Testament, 'All things that are in the heavens and that are on the earth, the visible and the invisible, the all things,'"—P. 227. By his own concession, therefore, it has that signification in Exodus xx. 11; and his construction, accordingly,

in which he assigns it a lower sense, and thence maintains that the making of these ascribed to God, was not a proper creation, falls to the ground. His pretext that the verb rendered made in that passage denotes simply an adjusting, arranging, or appropriating to new purposes, in contradistinction from a proper creation, is confuted also by its use there to denote the gift of being to all that are in the heavens, the earth, and the sea; that is, to plants, animals, and man, the lowest of which are not mere organisms, but have life; while animals have consciousness and activity, and man a spiritual as well as a corporeal and sensitive nature, which must necessarily, therefore, have been called into existence by "a proper creation." His second point is thus not only unsupported by evidence, but is in open contradiction to his own concessions, and to the meaning which the nature of the things there said to have been made, renders it necessary to assign to the verb by which their production is expressed.

In the fourth place, his pretext that the verb made, Exodus xx. 11, is used by a metaphor, and therefore does not denote a real creation, is equally unproved, mistaken, and fatal to his construction; for if, as he intimates, to adjust, re-arrange, or appropriate to a new purpose are senses which the verb to make acquires by a metaphor, then, unquestionably, when it is employed to denote the *origination* of the heavens, the earth, the sea, and all that in them is,—plants, animals, and man, it must, from their nature, denote "a proper creation." There is no ground whatever for supposing that the whole of the heavenly orbs, the whole earth, or the plants, animals, and man that were created in the six days, were ever readjusted, rearranged, or appropriated to a new purpose. The supposition is wholly contradictory to the nature of the latter, which have organization and life; and it is altogether gratuitous, improbable, and preposterous, in respect to the heavenly orbs and the earth. He does not, indeed, expressly assert that it is used there by a metaphor; but he implies it in the intimation that the verb rested, in that passage, is used by that figure. He says, "There is just as much reason to interpret that commandment as representing the Deity to faint and be weary, in direct contradiction to other parts of the Bible, as to maintain that it teaches the proper creation of the universe

to have taken place immediately before the institution of the Sabbath."—P. 228. Neither the verb, however, there translated rested, nor that which is rendered rested, Genesis ii. 2, 3, is used by a metaphor or any other figure. Their primary meaning is, *to cease from acting*, and that is the sense in which they are used there. It is in a secondary sense that they are employed when they are used to denote the refreshment which is the consequence of ceasing from action; but that, it is certain from the divine nature, is not their meaning there. His representation, therefore, that if the verb in Exodus xx. 11 is taken literally, it would import that the Deity was "faint and weary," proceeds on a total misapprehension of its proper signification; as, literally, it simply denotes to discontinue acting, it wholly precludes the idea of restoration from fatigue. He fails altogether, accordingly, in this, as in each of his other points. He does not even attempt formally to apply his principle of interpretation to these passages; there is no figure of any species in Genesis ii. 3, 4, and Exodus xx. 11, to which he could have applied it. His whole exposition, by which he endeavors to bring them into consistency with his theory, is without any other foundation than his mere dictum, and is in the most palpable contradiction to the unquestionable meaning of their terms.

He next proceeds to the interpretation of the second verse of the sacred narrative:

"'And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep.'

"The first inquiry here is, what relation does this paragraph bear to the preceding? Is it the relation of close connexion, an immediate sequence, or does it only express posteriority, without defining the separating interval? My conviction is, not the former, but the latter.

"The question will be answered by attending to the connecting particle. As it is rendered in our version, *it naturally* excites the *idea of immediate sequence.* But a few words will show that this would be an unwarranted inference from the expression in the original. This prefixed conjunction is the general connecting particle of the language; but the *mode* of connexion may be extremely various, and is always to be ascertained *by a consideration of the circumstances in every case.* It may be copulative, or disjunctive, or adversative; or it may express a mere annexation to a former topic of discourse,

the connexion being only that of the subject-matter, or the continuation of the composition. This continuative use forms one of the most marked peculiarities of the Hebrew idiom, and it comprehends every variety of mode in which one train of sentiment may be appended to another. The two sentences are thus rendered by a cautious and judicious critic, the late Dr. Dathe, of Leipsig: 'In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. But afterwards the earth became waste and desolate.' "—P. 231.

This point it behoved Dr. Smith to establish by the most indisputable evidence; as unless he demonstrated that a vast period intervened between the creation announced in the first verse, and the condition of the earth described in the second, his whole scheme for the conciliation of the narrative with his theory falls to the ground. He does not, however, offer any evidence of it whatever. All he alleges is the fact that the particle translated *and*, is sometimes used in a disjunctive and sometimes in an adversative sense, while he admits that the question whether it has such a sense in any instance, is "to be ascertained by a consideration of the circumstances." Not a syllable does he utter to show that it is employed in an adversative meaning here. As in respect to his boasted "principle," he contents himself with merely stating the fact or rule, and then at once assumes, without proof, that it yields the result which he claims; and this is the game he plays throughout his whole volume. A more discreditable sham; a meaner deception than the whole web of his discourse is, we have never met under the name of reasoning. It is plain he could not show that the particle rendered *and*, has here an adversative sense; that is, that it indicates that the waste and unfurnished condition of the earth was different from that in which it was created, and thence that a period of perhaps immeasurable length had intervened betwixt its creation and its becoming waste and unfurnished—which is what he affects to demonstrate—unless he could prove that that is the natural and customary meaning of the particle, and must be taken as its sense here, if there is not a positive and insuperable reason in the connexion for giving it a different signification; or else could demonstrate from the nature of God's creative act that the earth could not have been called into existence in a waste and un-

furnished state. But he offers no proof that *vau*, the particle rendered *and*, has such a signification; nor could he. The supposition is preposterous. He does not even allege a shadow of evidence that it has the adversative sense of *but* here; nor had he, and even established that as its genuine meaning, would it have contributed in the least degree to show that a long period or any space whatever intervened between the creation and the existence of the earth in its waste and unfurnished state. Let the passage be translated—"In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. But the earth was waste and unfurnished, and darkness was upon the face of the deep;" and the meaning is simply, that the earth was not created in the state in which it now exists; that is, fitted to be the abode of sentient beings; but was without light, without an atmosphere, without clouds, without dry land, and without vegetables, or animals. It does not imply at all that a vast space intervened between its creation, and its being thus devoid of all living forms, and unfit to be their residence. The particle *but* no more involves or countenances such a meaning than the particle *and*. Grant him, therefore, in the translation all that he asks, and he gains nothing whatever towards the demonstration of the point at which he aims, that a boundless series of ages passed after the creation of the earth, before it was divested of all living forms, stripped of an atmosphere, submerged beneath the ocean, and wrapt in absolute darkness.

There is no way, therefore, in which he could demonstrate that such a period intervened between its creation and its desolation, unless he could show either from the divine nature, the nature of a creative act, or the nature of the earth itself, that God must have created the world completely fitted, as it was at the close of the sixth day, to be the abode of living beings, and peopled with vegetables, animals, and man. But that he does not show. He does not attempt it. There is not the slightest likelihood that he saw or suspected that it was essential to his object. To penetrate even so short a distance beneath the surface was quite beyond the scope of his powers. Nor had he seen its necessity, or attempted to establish it, would he have succeeded. He could no more show from the divine perfections the nature of creation, or the nature of the earth, that God must have created it com-

pletely furnished, as it was at the end of the six days, as an abode of conscious and intelligent beings, and peopled with them, than he could prove from them that the earth would never be reduced from such a condition to a state of depopulation and ruin. If God's perfections or the nature of the earth render it impossible that it should have been called into existence without light, without an atmosphere, without clouds, without dry land, and without vegetables, animals, and man, why do they not equally show it to be impossible that it should afterwards have been divested of them, and reduced to solitude and ruin? The very fact, therefore, that it has existed in this condition, and that it was not by a single, but by a succession of creative acts that it was made habitable and peopled with plants, animals, and man, shows that there was no moral or physical obstacle to its being created in a waste and unfurnished state; and leaves Dr. Smith accordingly, without the slightest pretext of any description for the interpolation on which his whole scheme depends, of a vast period betwixt the creation and the epoch when the earth was waste and unfurnished, or without form and void.

The paraphrase, for it is not a translation, which he quotes from Dathe, and sanctions, was framed by that writer for the express purpose of producing a meaning in harmony with the geological theory. He says: Ex tot Theologorum et Philosophorum *hypothesibus* ad hujus capitis interpretationem allatis, mihi quidem hæc eligenda videbatur, quæ tum verbis textus Hebræi aptissima esset, tum observationibus virorum doctissimorum de interiori terræ nostræ structura non adversaretur. "Out of the numerous *hypotheses* brought forward by theologians and philosophers for the interpretation of this chapter, that, I think, should be selected, which, while it is best suited to the words of the text, is not adverse to the discoveries men of science have made in regard to the interior structure of the earth." Instead of indicating a cautious and judicious critic, it is altogether unworthy of a scholar. It grossly violates the passage first, by interpolating an adverb of time, and then by changing the verb, so that the affirmation with which the proposition becomes charged is wholly different from that which is expressed by the original. Posthæc vero terra facta erat vasta et deserta. "But

afterwards the earth *was made* waste and desolate." There is no word in the original answering to *afterwards*, and the verb, instead of being equivalent to "was made," is properly rendered in our version by *was*. Instead of the declaration, "and the earth was waste and desolate," he thus changes it so that it expresses the wholly different statement, that "*after* its creation the earth *was made* waste and desolate," which implies that it had, during a period intervening between its creation and that desolation, been furnished with light, air, dry land, and whatever else was requisite to render it habitable, and had been the scene of vegetable and animal life: a proposition utterly unlike that of the text: and his main reason for giving it this new shape and sense, he openly states, was the recent discoveries of geologists. Non describitur prima telluris nostræ productio, sed altera, sive ejus restauratio. Quod partim per observationes physicorum recentiorum probabile fit, qui in interioribus terræ partibus multa vestigia deprehendunt vetustioris et diuturnioris cujusdam inundationis, quam Noachicæ, cui insignes illæ mutationes, quas terra nostra subiit, olim a multis, sed parum accurate tribuebantur. "Not the first production of our earth is described [here, v. 2] but another, or rather its restoration. This is rendered probable by the investigations of recent geologists, who find in the interior of the earth many traces of a deluge more ancient and of longer continuance than that of Noah, to which heretofore many have very improperly ascribed the great revolutions of which the earth has been the subject." He gives as a further reason for that construction, that the terms rendered without form and void, are sometimes employed by the sacred writers to describe places that had been *reduced* from a habitable and flourishing state, to devastation and ruin; as though their use in that relation was an obstacle to their being used to describe the waste and unfurnished condition in which the earth was originally brought into existence. If the state in which the earth first existed was such as the words properly denote, why might they not as naturally and legitimately be used to express it, as to describe a somewhat similar state to which portions of the earth were in later ages reduced? He finally adds, as a further reason for this hypothesis, that he thought he escaped the difficulties with which other cosmogonies are

embarrassed respecting the existence of light before the fourth day. Tandem sese hæc hypothesis valde commendat a facilitate suâ, quâ difficultates in illis cosmogoniis subtiliter excogitatis obvias—ex quibus unam illam de primâ luci, quali, cum sol nondum extitit nominare lubet, minime coacte removet. His interpretation and paraphrase of the passage, by which he gave a wholly new and false meaning, was thus devised for the very purpose of forcing it into harmony with the geological theory. Yet Dr. Smith, who was perfectly aware of this, quotes his interpolated and perverted rendering, as though it were the work of "a cautious and judicious critic," who was governed solely in his construction by the terms of the Hebrew text, and the established laws of philology!

Such is the issue of his attempt to show from the particle *vau, and*, that a vast period intervened between the fiat by which the earth and heavens were called into existence, and the epoch to which the statement relates, that the earth was waste and unfurnished! Did ever a critic make a more unfortunate exhibition of himself? Was there ever a more unwarrantable or more senseless attempt to force a foreign and unnatural meaning on the word of God for the purpose of extorting from it a sanction of a false and preposterous theory?

After this extraordinary criticism, he proceeds to show that the earth which was thus waste and unfurnished, was not the earth universally, or the globe, but only a small portion of it.

"A most important subject of our inquiry is the genuine meaning of the word which we render earth. The most general sense of the word is, *the portion of the universe* which the Supreme has assigned for the habitation of mankind. [This makes it stand for heaven and hell, where portions of the race reside, as well as for this world.] When it is conjoined with the heavens, it denotes the entire created world; but it is evident of itself that the practical understanding of the phrase would be in conformity with the ideas of the people who used it. [What a flood of light this observation throws on the question! It is plain that *practically* the word was understood to mean, what the Hebrews used it to mean: that is, it was used as it was used.] Frequently it stands for the land of Palestine; and, indeed,

for any country or district that is mentioned or referred to in the connexion. Sometimes it denotes a mere plot of ground, and sometimes the soil, clay and sand, or any earthy matter. Often it is put figuratively for mankind, as the inhabitants of the world. *Considering all the evidence of the case, I can find no reason against our* considering the word, subsequently to the first verse, and throughout the whole description of the six days, as designed to express *a part of our world* which God was adapting for the dwelling of man and the animals connected with him. This portion of the earth I conceive to have been a large part of Asia, lying between the Caucasian ridge, the Caspian sea, and Tartary on the north, the Persian and Indian seas on the south, and the high mountain ridges which run at considerable distances on the eastern and western flank."—Pp. 231–233.

His establishing this point is of the utmost necessity to the success of the other parts of his construction, as if the earth which was waste, unfurnished, and wrapt in darkness, was the whole globe, it follows by his own concession, that the work of the six days must have been "a proper creation," and not a mere "modelling, or new forming;" and his vaunted reconciliation of the text with his geological theory, breaks down again, as it has at every previous stage of his argument. What evidence then does he allege that the sense of the word in this passage is that which he assigns it? Not a particle. He does not even attempt it. He utters not a syllable to show from the nature of the divine acts, the condition of the earth, or anything else in the connexion, that that must be its meaning here. He offers nothing as the reason of his construction, except the fact that it has in some instances a narrower sense. But as it is known in those instances that it has that restricted meaning from the connexion, if any such reason exists in this case for assigning it that narrower signification, he should have pointed it out. Instead of that, however, he contents himself with stating that that is its meaning *in some other passages;* which is no ground whatever for such a construction of it in this instance: and then takes what he proposes to prove for granted, that that is its sense here; and this completely satisfies his idea of demonstration. It answers all the demands of his logic. That anything further is necessary; that the fact that the word has one meaning in a particular connexion, is not sufficient

evidence that it has or may have that meaning in any other, he had not the slightest suspicion; and on this mere imaginary foundation, which it were wholly discreditable to a man of sense to mistake for a reality, he rests the whole fabric of his scheme for the reconciliation of the sacred history with his geological theory.

But he not only fails to give any proof of the point which he proposes to establish; he wholly confutes that pretence by the concession that the noun *aretz*, earth in its proper sense, is the name of this world, and that that is always its meaning when it is conjoined with the heavens. For it being conjoined with them in Gen. i. 1, it is unquestionably used in that sense in the verse that follows, as it has the article prefixed which, from the sense in which it is employed in the first verse, defines it as denoting *the earth, this world* in contradistinction from the heavens; and this whole world in contradistinction from a particular land or region. Had Dr. Smith extended his researches to the description of Eden, chap. ii. 11, 13, in which it is used to denote the particular land of Havilah and the land of Ethiopia, he would have found that it is there without the article. What a beautiful exemplification of the critical investigation of which he makes so pompous a parade! "I assure my friends," he says, "that I have not spared time and pains in pursuing this inquiry." It is conjoined with the heavens also, Gen. ii. 4, and Ex. xx. 11, and is likewise in each of those instances preceded by the article. By his own concession then, as well as by the laws of the language, it indisputably in all those instances denotes *the earth* in its absolute sense—the whole of this terraqueous world.

Yet this is all that he presents "to the impartial judgment of Bible scholars," in explanation of the method of understanding the Mosaic account of the creation by which he professes it is brought into consistency with his theory. He adds, indeed, two or three pages on other parts of Gen. i., but they are merely occupied in the repetition of opinions he had already expressed. He does not attempt to offer any further proof that his rule of interpretation relieves the sacred text from its antagonism with his geological theory.

The sum total that he accomplishes by his famous "principle," that is to save the sacred volume from the disgrace of

confutation by geology, and justify the church in continuing to receive it as a revelation, is comprised in the mere statement—that is denied by no one, and has no bearing whatever on the subject—that the Hebrew *vau* sometimes has the sense of *but* instead of *and*, and that the noun *aretz* in some cases denotes a particular land or region, and even the clay and sand that constitute the soil, instead of the earth itself as a whole. That they have these meanings in Gen. i. 3, ii. 3, 4, and Ex. xx. 11, and that *aretz* has the sense he ascribes to it—which is what he was to show—he does not attempt to prove. It is not, therefore, by *the interpretation* of these texts that he affects to settle the question, but only by the interpretation of those terms in others with which they have no connexion. It is on their meaning, consequently, in unrelated passages, according to him, that the question turns, whether the Bible is confuted or not by the geological theory! And it is by his oracular announcement solely of their import, in such cases, after "sparing no time or pains" in discovering it, that he achieves the extrication of the sacred word from the peril to which it is otherwise exposed! Was there ever a more pitiable farce? Did such a parade of learning, such a pomp of professions, such a swell of consequence and self-congratulation at a great achievement ever before prove so sheer a sham? Ignorance, vanity, or treachery itself, could scarcely, in our judgment, have got up a more discreditable pageant either to dishonor the word of God, or delude the superficial and credulous. Had it been his aim to disgrace the Bible by exhibiting it as wholly incapable of vindication; had he studied to yield the infidel the easiest possible triumph over it, by representing its defence as resting on pretexts so false and frivolous that none but fanatics and idiots would undertake to sustain it, we know of no more effective method that he could have taken for the purpose. Its cause must be truly desperate if, as he represents, *vau* and *aretz* are the only instruments by which it can be shielded from conviction as a false record; and its defence by them is to be achieved—not by their meaning in the passages on which the question turns, but on a narrower sense with which they are sometimes used in others that have no possible bearing on their import in the history of the creation. His treatment of it as a theologian and philosopher, is precisely like that of the

wag who undertook to prove that the arts of spinning and weaving were the first that were invented, from the fact that the first pair, immediately after their fall, made aprons for themselves by sewing, which, he claimed, implies the use of thread, an article produced by spinning; and then from the fact that the word apron is used in the only other instance of its occurrence in the Bible, Acts xix. 12, to denote garments that were manufactured from thread by weaving, he claimed that though made of fig leaves, they must have been woven. Yet this miserable desecration, this shameful betrayal of the word of God, is accepted by a crowd of smatterers in science, as a triumphant vindication of it from the objections of the geological theory!

Such is the issue of Dr. Smith's work. Such are the proofs that instead of achieving the object at which he professes to aim, he completely betrays and sacrifices it, and yields to the enemies of revelation all that they claim. No more unfortunate condition can be conceived than that in which he has placed the subject. No more embarrassing and discreditable attitude can be imagined than that which they have assumed who have given their sanction to his preposterous method of defending the sacred narrative. The infidel has only to avail himself of the arguments with which Dr. S. has furnished him, to gain an easy victory over them. He needs only to say, "You regard Dr. Smith as one of your most learned men. He was at the head of a theological seminary. He is honored as the ablest and most successful champion of the Bible in its conflict with geology. You, yourselves, rely for the defence of your cause on his advocacy. Yet the mode in which he treats the subject shows that the reconciliation of the narrative in Genesis with the geological theory, which you admit is the only method by which the Scriptures can be saved from confutation, is altogether impracticable. After all his learned discussions, after all his boasts and self-congratulations at the ease with which he is to overcome the most formidable difficulties by his 'principle of interpretation,' it turns out in the end that his boasted principle is no principle at all of interpretation, and has no power whatever to effect the conciliation which he professes to achieve by it. So far from it, the whole that he accomplishes is to state that the two words *yom* and *arets* in Gen. i.

'2, sometimes have a different meaning from that which is usually assigned them in that passage; and yet while he exhibits the whole question as turning on them, he does not attempt to prove that either of them has *there* the sense which he affixes to them. He therefore not only demonstrates nothing which he promises, but he rests his cause on pretexts so weak, so frivolous, and so palpably false, as to show that he has no ground on which he can effectively maintain it. In accepting him, therefore, as your champion, you in effect admit that the Scriptures cannot be defended from the objections of geology."

Such is the embarrassing and discreditable position in which they place themselves, who, assenting to the geological theory, rely on Dr. Smith's method of bringing the Mosaic history of the creation into harmony with it. It is surely time that the friends of revelation ceased to give their sanction to such an incompetent and treacherous guide. It is time that they became aware of the folly and presumption of attempting to force the history in Genesis into consistency with the contradictions of geology; and saw that to give assent to that system, is in effect to impeach the truth of the Bible, and put a weapon into the hand of its enemies with which they may with more effect than with any other, set aside its claims to be received as a revelation from God.

Art. II.—The Rev. Albert Barnes's Notes on Revelation xx. 4–6.

By the Rev. H. Carleton.

We propose to review only what Mr. Barnes has said respecting the resurrection, spoken of in these verses. "And I saw," the apostle says, "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." We find it somewhat difficult to give our author's interpretation of this passage, and, indeed, he seems

to have had a difficulty in framing a clear expression of his views. He says, "they were put to death in the body, but their *souls* were now seen to be alive. They had not ceased to be, but they lived and reigned with Christ *as if* they had been raised up from the dead." Again, he says, "the meaning, then, so far as the language is concerned, must be, that there would exist at the time of the thousand years, a state of things *as if* the martyrs were raised up from the dead." But not exactly satisfied with this form of expression, he adds, "an honoring of the martyrs *as if* they should live and reign with Christ. Their names would be vindicated, their principles would be revived, they would be exalted in public estimation. They would be raised from the low rank in which they were held in the world in times of persecution, to a state which might well be represented by their sitting with Christ on the throne of government, and by their being made visible attendants on his glorious kingdom." In his concluding remarks, he refers to this passage in the following manner: "There will be a reviving, and a prevalence of the spirit which actuated the saints in the best days, and a restoration of their principles as the grand principles which will control and govern the church, *as if* the most eminent saints were raised again from the dead, and lived and acted upon the earth."

Does he mean that there will be men on earth during the millennium like the martyrs, and that they will rule the church? That is evidently not the opinion which he designed to give. Does he mean then simply that the principles of the martyrs will be in all men? This would not seem to satisfy his mind. Does he mean that the martyrs will be honored in the opinion of the public, or by having the show or appearance of reigning with Christ? This does not seem to give a true expression of his views. Furthermore, he does not seem to have been satisfied with his statement of the meaning of the passage as quoted above, for he says, "In this view of the meaning of this passage, there is nothing that forbids us to suppose that the martyrs will be *conscious* of the honor thus done to their names, their memory, and their principles on earth, or that this consciousness will increase their joy even in heaven."

In order to show that the views which he has given, what-

ever they are, are the true sense or meaning of the passage, he has attempted to disprove the correctness of other interpretations, and assumed that no other interpretation than his remains. It is considered a true mathematical demonstration of the correctness of an hypothesis, to show that any even the least departure from it would be false. This kind of demonstration is sometimes as satisfactory as the direct method or process. But Mr. Barnes does not use this method. He examines other interpretations, and having shown, as he thinks, that they are incorrect, he assumes that the view he has given must be the only one that remains to be given. He should have shown that any departure from his views necessarily involves an absurdity. His attempts to sustain his interpretation by Scripture usage, will not, we think, to persons generally, be very satisfactory. Not a few, at least, will question the correctness of his interpretation of Ch. xi. 11. His reference, also, to Ezekiel, is not in point, for the prophet saw in vision, Rev. xx. 4–6, a literal resurrection of bodies. He, however, will have it, that no such resurrection can, by any fair rules of interpretation, be made out from the passage. Had he admitted that the language does appropriately describe a literal resurrection of the dead, then there might have been an appearance of propriety in referring to Ezekiel to justify his construction. The reference to Hosea vi. 2, and Luke xv. 32, is unhappy, for the persons in these passages, who were raised up, or were alive again, are the same persons who were afflicted or had been dead. In an argument to sustain a spiritual interpretation of the passage against such a construction of it as would imply a literal resurrection, our author should not have referred to Isa. xxvi. 19, for he must have supposed that his opponents would claim that that passage teaches a literal resurrection of the pious dead. An attempt has been made by those who think this passage teaches a spiritual resurrection, to show that such an interpretation has an illustration in the fact that the prediction, "I will send Elijah the prophet," had its fulfilment in John the Baptist, because he came "in the spirit and power of Elijah." But Elijah was a real person, a true and veritable man and prophet, and as such he could be made a symbol of another real person and prophet. But those agreeing with Mr. Barnes, deny that this passage

describes, or that it can be made to describe a literal resurrection of the dead; or saints living again in their bodies after they had been dead; consequently the analogy fails.

The main point aimed at by our author in his interpretation of the passage, seems to have been to disprove the construction adopted by those who believe that it teaches a literal resurrection of the saints at the commencement of the millennium, and our main object will be to show that his reasoning is unsound, and that the passage does teach a literal resurrection of the bodies of the saints, and that this is the most obvious sense of the passage. When we have done this, we shall endeavor to show that a spiritual or allegorical interpretation must be utterly incongruous.

We shall consider the objections which Mr. Barnes makes to the literal or most obvious construction of the passage, or, as he would say, to the interpretation of millenarians, in the order in which they occur in his notes:—

"There is strong *presumptive* evidence against this interpretation, and especially against the main point in the doctrine—that there will be a *literal resurrection* of the bodies of the saints at the beginning of that millennial period to live and reign with Christ on earth, from the following circumstances: —It is admitted on all hands that this doctrine, if contained in the Scriptures at all, is found in this one passage only. It is not pretended that there is in any other place a direct affirmation that this will literally occur, nor would the advocates for that opinion undertake to show that it is fairly implied in any other part of the Bible."

Millenarians have a right to complain when a man with the reputation which Mr. Barnes has with very many of the American churches, as a commentator, makes such an unwarranted statement as is contained in the above extract; and if any other class of persons should have like injustice done them, they would be excused, if not justified by considerate men, if they should in their complaints use severe language. If the doctrine that the saints will be raised and reign on the earth with Christ, is not to be found in any other part of the Bible, where did the Jews get it? That they did believe it, Mr. Barnes will not deny. Nor will he deny that the disciples of our Lord believed it while he was upon earth. He admits that it was received by the most eminent fathers who

lived near the times of the apostles, or were contemporary with them. Will he say the Jews held it by tradition and without any authority from the Scriptures, but the Christians first derived it from the twentieth chap. of Revelation? The harmony of the opinion of the Jews respecting the resurrection with what is taught in 1 Thess. iv., is admitted by Mr. Barnes. On the phrase, "*And the dead in Christ shall rise first*," he says, "that is before the living shall be changed." A doctrine similar to this was held by the Jews.

Resch Lachisch said, "those who die in Israel, shall rise first in the days of the Messiah." Where did they obtain their views respecting (see notes on the passage) the resurrection, which they expressed in language similar to that used by the apostle?

Mr. B. says, "reason unassisted by revelation never dared to conjecture that such scenes would occur; if it had, it would have had no arguments on which the conjecture could be supported." Now as the literal reign of the saints with Christ on earth, was an essential element in the creed of the Jews respecting the resurrection, where could they have obtained their views? Certainly not from reason, "for reason never dared to conjecture" what is taught by the apostles, and was held by the Jews. Must they not have supposed the Scriptures taught it? Had Mr. Barnes said that the doctrine which he combats is not fairly implied in any other part of the Bible, we should not complain, for we should only regard him as opposing his opinion to the opinion of others. That he thinks that the doctrine of millenarians is not to be found in the Old Testament, may be true enough, for he says in his concluding remarks on 1 Thess. iv., "This passage, v. 13, 18, contains a truth which is to be found in no classic writer, and nowhere else, except in the teachings of the New Testament." Now if he thinks the doctrine of the resurrection is not taught in the Old Testament, he ought to do the Jews the justice to admit that they think they find it taught there. And he ought to do his fellow Christians, called millenarians, the justice to think that they sincerely believe their opinions are taught in very many passages both in the Old and New Testaments, since they say they do and have not failed to make the attempt to prove the justness of this persuasion. How does

Mr. Barnes think millenarians would interpret Isa. xxvi. 18, 21, Job xix. 25–27, and Dan. xii. 13? We do not ask how he would interpret them, as he doubtless does not think either of them teaches even the resurrection of the body, though it is positively affirmed. But we cannot see how he could have written comments on these passages, and not have conjectured that millenarians would refer to them as plainly teaching their views.

Whether others think that the doctrine of the reign of the saints on earth with Christ is taught elsewhere in the Bible besides Revelation xx. or not, it is certain that Mr. Barnes has given an interpretation to one other passage, at least, which necessarily involves the fact that the saints will be raised before, or at the commencement of the period described in Rev. xx. 4–6, usually called the millennium.

In his notes on 2 Thess. ii. he has given it as his opinion, that by the "man of sin" the Papacy is most certainly designated. He also supposes that the beasts described in Rev. xiii. when allied, designate the Papacy. We have not Mr. Barnes's notes on Dan. xii. at hand, but we presume from his references to them, that he also supposes that the Papacy is symbolized by the fourth beast, especially after the coming up of the little horn.

Mr. Barnes also thinks that the coming of the Lord, spoken of in 2 Thess. ii. 8, is the second personal coming of Christ, at which the righteous dead will be raised. He thinks, of course, that all the dead will be raised at that time. On the phrase "by the coming," he says, "the idea of Paul is, in regard to that great event of which I spoke to you in my former epistle, the coming of the Saviour." On the phrase, "our gathering together unto him," he comments, "there is manifest allusion here to what is said in the first epistle" (chap. iv. 17), "then we shall be caught up together with them in the clouds." (See notes on 2 Thess. ii. 1.) The coming spoken of in the eighth verse, Mr. B. thinks, is also a personal coming. He calls it the Second Advent of the Redeemer, and refers it to the "manifestation of the Saviour when he shall come to judge the world." (See his notes on verse 8.) It also appears from Mr. Barnes's notes, that he thinks the apostle Paul taught that the Papacy designated by "the man of sin," is the same that is symbolized by the

union of the two beasts of the apostle John, and that it will be utterly destroyed by Christ at this, his coming. On the destruction of the man of sin he comments as follows: "The methods by which this will be done are immediately specified, and it is of much importance to understand them, if this refers to the Papacy. With the spirit of his mouth, what goes out of his mouth, or what he speaks; that is, word, truth, command, or gospel, all of which he may be regarded as speaking. In Rev. i. 16, xix. 15, 21, it is said of the Redeemer that a sharp two-edged sword goeth out of his mouth; that is, his word, doctrines, or command. *What he speaks* is like a sharp sword. It will cut deep; will lay open the heart; will destroy his enemies. Comp. Isaiah ii. 4. With the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked. The reference in the passage before us is to one of the methods which would be employed to 'destroy' the man of sin; and the sense is, that it would be by what is spoken by the Redeemer. This may refer either to what he will say *at his coming*, or to his *truth* already spoken; to what has gone from his lips, by whomsoever uttered; and the meaning then is, that one of the grand agencies for destroying this anti-christian power is the truth spoken or revealed by the Saviour; that is, his pure gospel. If this latter be the true interpretation, it may mean that the process for his destruction may have commenced long anterior to the personal appearing of the Redeemer, but that the *complete* destruction of his power will be accomplished by the splendor of his Second Advent. It cannot be denied, however, that the most obvious interpretation is that which refers both clauses in the sentence to the same period, that of his second coming. Still, it is not improper to suppose that it may be implied that his power will be weakened and diminished by the influence of the gospel, though it may not be wholly destroyed until the second coming of the Saviour. '*And shall destroy*'—καταργήσει—shall bring to naught, cause to cease; put an end to. This is, in some respects, a stronger word than that which in the former part of the verse is rendered consume. It denotes a more entire *destruction* than that, though it does not refer so much to any positive agency by which it will be accomplished. In the former word, the attention is directed more to the agency by which the destruction will

be effected, to the exertion of some kind of power to do it; in this word the attention is directed rather to the entireness or totality of the destruction. The anti-christian dominion will *wholly* cease or be *entirely* destroyed." (See his notes on the passage.) In his analysis of 2 Thess. ii. Mr. B. says, "This great foe of God was to be destroyed by the coming of the Saviour, and one object of his appearing would be to put an end to his dominion." Here we have this fact clearly expressed, viz. that Mr. Barnes believes the apostle taught that the anti-christian power denominated "the man of sin," would continue up to the coming of Christ, however much it might have been weakened prior to that event, and that the Saviour would himself destroy or put an end to that person, though he should use his gospel as well as his power or command in doing it; and to do this would be one object of his coming. We will now recur to Mr. Barnes's notes on Revelation, and if possible, ascertain at what time he fixes the destruction of the anti-christian power, which he supposes is identical with the Papacy. In his notes on Rev. xi. 15, he comments as follows: "This is the last of the trumpets, implying, of course, that under this the series of visions was to end, and that this was to introduce the state of things under which the affairs of the world were to be wound up. The place which this occupies in the order of time is, when the events pertaining to the colossal Roman power, the fourth kingdom of Daniel (Dan. ii. 7), should have been completed, and when the reign of the saints (Dan. vii. 9, 14, 27, 28), should have been introduced. This, both in Daniel and in John, is to occur when the mighty power of the Papacy shall have been overthrown at the termination of the twelve hundred and sixty years of its duration. In both Daniel and John the termination of that persecuting power is the commencement of the reign of the saints, the downfall of the Papacy, the introduction of the kingdom of God on the earth."

On Rev. xix. 20, Mr. B. makes the following notes: "The beast here, as all along, refers to the Papal power, and the idea is that of its complete and utter overthrow, *as if* the leader of an army were taken captive and tormented in burning flames, and all his followers were cut down on the field of battle. That is, the overthrow will be as signal and the

destruction as complete as if the leaders of the combined hosts should be taken alive and thrown into a pit or lake that burns with intense heat." In his concluding remarks he says, "The true religion would be as triumphant *as if* the Son of God should go forth as a warrior in his own might, and secure their leaders for punishment, and give up their hosts to the birds of prey. This destruction of these great enemies, which the whole course of the interpretation leads us to suppose is still future, prepares the way for the millennial reign of the Son of God, as stated in the following chapter."

Thus, it appears, that Mr. Barnes makes the destruction of the Papacy, or anti-christian power which he supposes is designated by "the man of sin," in 2 Thess. ii. and symbolized in Revelation by the beast and false prophet united, synchronize with the commencement of the millennium. By making "the man of sin" denote the Papacy, and the beast and false prophet denote the Papacy also, he has made "the man of sin," and the beast and the false prophet allied together, identical and different symbols or designations of the same anti-christian power. The destruction of the beast and false prophet, and the cutting off of all those who worshipped the beast, he makes complete and utter, so that there can be no remains to spring up in some remote period of time. His language is as strong, if not stronger, than that which he uses in commenting on the destruction of "the man of sin." Both the destruction of "the man of sin," as given in 2 Thess. ii. and of the beast and the false prophet, Mr. Barnes ascribes to the Son of God. Of "the man of sin," he says, one object of his appearing would be to put an end to his dominion; and in his comments on the destruction of antichrist, as predicted in Revelation, he says, "The true religion would be as triumphant, as if the Son of God should go forth in his *own might* and secure the leaders for punishment, and give up their hosts to the birds of prey." It is as evident as language can make it, that Mr. Barnes has represented the destruction of "the man of sin," as given 2 Thess. ii. as identical with the destruction of the anti-christian power as given in Revelation. That which is destroyed is identical. The destruction is identical, for both are utter,

complete, and final, and he who destroys is the same. Therefore the time of destruction must be the same. But the destruction of antichrist, as given in Revelation, precedes the millennium. Therefore, the destruction of "the man of sin" precedes the millennium. But the destruction of "the man of sin" is to take place when Christ shall come the second time and the pious dead shall be raised; therefore, the destruction of antichrist will be when Christ comes the second time, and when the pious dead shall be raised. Therefore Christ will come and raise the pious dead at or before the commencement of the millennium. This conclusion is derived from plain and unqualified statements of Mr. Barnes, in his notes on different passages of Scripture. We have not misunderstood him; we have not misrepresented him, unless we are grossly deceived. If any should suppose that by the destruction of "the man of sin," in 2 Thess. ii., he means the punishment in the future world, he will easily see, by recurring to his notes on the passage, that that was not his meaning. It is the Papacy that is to be destroyed, which, though according to his opinion the preaching of the truth may weaken, yet its power is not to be dissolved except by Christ at his coming. The subject of destruction was, to use his own language, "a great anti-christian power." The destruction, therefore, could not mean the assignment of individuals to punishment in the future world, although those united in sustaining this power will be thus punished.

Neither, on the other hand, will Mr. Barnes's comments admit of a resuscitation of the old anti-christian power, preserved in a subdued state during the millennium, for he makes its destruction complete and utter; and, in speaking of the opposition that shall be made to Christ and the saints after the millennium, he is utterly at a loss to tell how it will come. He says, "Why this will be permitted, or what causes will bring it about, what subordinate agencies will be employed, is not said, and conjecture would be vain." Mr. Barnes has, therefore, represented that the Scriptures teach the following points. Let us not be understood as saying that he meant to give these representations, or that he really regards them as true, nor that some of them are not denied, or contradicted by him.

He has represented that the Scriptures teach—

1. That the pious dead will be raised by Christ at his second coming.

2. That Christ will destroy the Papacy, or the anti-christian power, at his second coming.

3. That the Papacy, or the anti-christian power, will be destroyed by Christ, at or before the commencement of the millennium.

4. By deduction from the above, that the coming of Christ, personally, or the second time, the resurrection of the pious dead, the destruction of the anti-christian power, and the commencement of the millennium, all synchronize, or will be so nearly associated in time, that the occurrence of any one of them will determine the time also of the others.

The passages are by no means few which speak of the downfall of the anti-christian power, and of the reign of Christ on earth. Millenarians believe very many of these passages teach that, at that time, Christ will come. But it is not our design now to comment on them. It is our present object to call attention to the fact, that Mr. Barnes has himself admitted that Christ will come the second time then, and that the saints will then be raised.

How now stands the presumptive evidence against the interpretation of Rev. xx. 4, which affirms "a literal resurrection of the bodies of the saints at the beginning of the millennial period, to live and reign on the earth?" Mr. Barnes makes a presumptive objection against this interpretation, by saying, that if the doctrine is taught in the Scriptures, it is taught in this passage only; that it is directly affirmed in no other place; and that its advocates would not undertake to show that it is fairly implied in any other." In opposition to this, we have shown that Mr. Barnes has himself so interpreted the Scriptures, as to make it implied in very many passages; and, if his views of 2 Thess. ii., and of a large part of the prophecy of Daniel, and of Revelation, to the close of the xixth chapter, are correct, we should necessarily expect to find, in the xxth chapter, an announcement of the resurrection of the saints, to be glorified with the triumphing Saviour, whose appearing to destroy "the man of sin," "the beast and false prophet," the "anti-christian forces," or, as Mr. Barnes thinks, the Papacy (for he thinks they are all

one), which is to be contemporary with that resurrection, has been announced. It appears, therefore, from a consideration of other Scriptures, that the presumption is in favor of the interpretation of this passage which affirms a literal resurrection of the saints. We will here only add, that the belief that the Scriptures plainly teach that there will be a thousand years or more of peace and prosperity to the church before the coming of our Lord, and the resurrection of the righteous, is utterly inconsistent with another statement of Mr. Barnes. Commenting on 1 Thess. v. 6, on the phrase, "But let us watch," he says:—

"That is, for the coming of the Lord. Let us regard it as an event which is certainly to occur, and which *may* occur at any moment. This cannot be, if a thousand years will intervene. The duty of watchfulness is certainly enjoined upon all; and this was not inconsistent with the declaration that 'the man of sin' would first be revealed, for no one could tell how soon or how rapidly he would come, or how long he would continue. But if the Scriptures positively affirm a long reign of peace, at least of a thousand years' duration, before the coming of the Lord, it is not true that he *may* come any moment."

Second objection:—

2. "If this is a true doctrine, it would be reasonable to expect that a clear and unambiguous statement of it would be made. Certainly, if there is but *one* statement on the subject, that might be expected to be a perfectly clear one. It would be a statement about which there could be no diversity of opinion, concerning which those who embrace it might be expected to have the same views. But it cannot be pretended that this is so in regard to this passage."

So far as this objection rests upon the false assumption, contained in the first objection, it has been already answered, and this constitutes the main part of it. So far as it assumes that the truth which the passage teaches should be so stated, that there would be no diversity of opinion, it is based upon an impossibility. So far as it assumes that those who believe in millenarianism are divided in opinion respecting its meaning, it is apprehended to be incorrect. And so far as it assumes that it does not teach in a clear and unambiguous

manner the resurrection of the saints, we trust we shall be able to show that it is without foundation, and that, too, by rules of interpretation which Mr. Barnes himself adopts. But this will appropriately be discussed under another topic.

Third objection: —

3. It is presumptive proof against this, that nothing is said of the employment of those who are raised up, of the reason why they are raised, of the new circumstances of their being, and of their condition when the thousand years shall have ended."

We are told something about the employment of those who will be raised up, to wit, that they shall be "priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years." This seems to have been all that God thought it best should be revealed on the subject, and, perhaps, gives us as definite an idea of it as any communication could; for the apostle John says, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be." As to the reason why the saints are raised from the grave at the commencement of the millennium, perhaps we might say that the best reason is, that God has been pleased to glorify himself, in saving men and raising them up from the grave, and giving them immortal bodies. He has reasons, no doubt, for raising them up to reign with Christ, though we may not see why he should employ their services. Can Mr. Barnes tell anything more about the employment of the saints in glory, and of the reasons of their being raised up according to his views of the resurrection? In respect to the new circumstances of their being, we would only refer to the answer which the apostle made to those who, arguing against the resurrection, asked, as if with an air of triumph, with what body do they come? 1 Cor. xv. 35.

And as for their condition after the thousand years shall have ended, since it so pleased the Holy Spirit that that subject should be sufficiently discoursed upon in another and more appropriate place, we ought not to demand that it should have received attention in this passage.

Fourth objection:—

"If it be meant that this is a description of the resurrection of

the righteous as such, embracing all the righteous, then it is wholly unlike all other descriptions of the resurrection of the righteous in the Bible. Here the account is confined to 'those that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and to those who had not worshipped the beast.'"

It cannot be expected, nor is it reasonable to require, that the same description shall be repeated as often as the resurrection of the righteous is alluded to. That the language comprehends all the righteous, we think, is sufficiently evident, if we suitably consider the import of the terms employed: "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." On the phrase "were beheaded," Mr. Barnes adopts the following note from Prof. Stuart: "It cannot be supposed to have been the intention of the writer to confine the rewards of martyrs to those who suffered in this particular way." No one will doubt the reasonableness of this remark. More than the martyrs are included in the description. Those "who had not worshipped the beast" are included, whether they had suffered death for the witness of Jesus or not. And who are these? The sacred writer includes in the class of those who worship the beast, "*all* whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world." It is further said, "and all the world wondered after the beast, and they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast, and they worshipped the beast." Who are they whose names are written in the Lamb's book of life? This phrase includes all the people of God. Mr. Barnes has the following note on Rev. xx. 15: "The single condition here stated, as that which would save any from being cast into the lake of fire, is, that they are found written in the book of life." Hence, when it is said, "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and power was given him over all kindred, and tongues, and nations, and all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb, slain from the foundation of the world," we must necessarily conclude that all Christians are included in the exception; and, if so,

then all Christians are included in the class designated in chap. xx. 4. We see no possibility of avoiding this conclusion. But perhaps it will be said that the whole description, contained in Rev. xiii., relates only to a particular age of the world, and has no reference either to the wicked or the righteous who lived before the coming of Christ. Since it has been shown that by those who have not worshipped the beast, all Christians are meant, at least who live in the times referred to, and as it will be admitted that this period includes all the time, from the days of Christ and his apostles until the commencement of the millennium, there can be no possible doubt, if all those are raised up, the ancient saints will be raised up with them, for the body of Christ is one. In this manner we should interpret our Saviour's prayer for his disciples, which, in words, includes only those who then lived, or would live. But no one doubts that all who have ever lived, and have been saved by faith in him, will participate in the eternal blessings which he then prayed for. However, since men worship the beast because he is the agent of Satan, it is most natural to presume that all the followers of Satan are designated by the worshippers of the beast, and all the followers of Christ by those who do not worship it. It is worthy of remark, that the terms used in this text are as comprehensive as are generally used in the New Testament to designate those who will be raised at the coming of Christ. Terms are used, indeed, which, by a proper construction, would imply that all the people of God, in every age, will be raised; but yet in form they have immediate reference to those who have lived, or will live, since the first coming of Christ. They are said to be "Christ's," "those who sleep in Jesus;" that is, those who have died in the faith that Jesus is the Christ.

Fifth objection:—

5. "In reference to many of the views necessarily implied in the doctrine of the second advent, and avowed by those who hold that doctrine, it cannot be pretended that they receive any countenance or support from this passage."

And what if they are not mentioned here? What has that to do with the interpretation of this passage? And must

we suppose that all Scripture doctrines are always taught in the same text? We are accustomed to think that the creed of the Presbyterian Church is a system, in such a sense, that the adoption of one part will lead to the belief of the rest. And must we suppose that every part of the creed is taught in every text which teaches any one of the truths embraced in it?

We certainly can see no force in this objection, on which our author is perhaps more eloquent than on any other. It may be proper to add, however, that the language employed by the sacred writer here, in speaking of the resurrection and reign of the saints with Christ, not only harmonizes with, but is suggestive of the whole millenarian system. No one, we presume, desires more than this.

Sixth objection:—

6. "Nor is there anything here of a literal resurrection of the bodies of the dead as Prof. Stuart himself supposes."

This is the great point of our author. He says, "of this there is not one word, one intimation, one hint in the passage before us." In his notes on the phrase—and *I saw* the souls—he says—

"This is a very important expression in regard to the meaning of the whole passage. John says he saw the souls—not the bodies. The doctrine which has been held and is held by those who maintain that there will be a literal resurrection of the saints to reign with Christ during a thousand years, can receive no support from this passage, for there is no ambiguity respecting the word souls, ψυχας, as used here. By no possible construction can it mean the bodies of the saints."

Let us first examine this bold statement by the application of a principle which Mr. Barnes has given us, commenting on Acts ii. 27, on the phrase, "Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell." Our author says, "Instances where the word translated soul (Heb. נפש, Greek ψυχη) is put for the individual himself, meaning 'we,' 'myself,' may be seen in Ps. xi. 1; xxxv. 3, 7; Job ix. 21. There is no clear instance in which it is applied to the soul in its separate state or disjoined from the body." This is perhaps too strong an ex-

pression. If he had said there is no instance where the soul is said "to live" in a separate state from the body, he would have expressed the exact truth. In summing up his discussion of the meaning of the phrase, he says, "In the place before us therefore the meaning is simply, *thou wilt not leave me among the dead.* This conveys *all* the idea. It does not mean literally the grave, or sepulchre; that relates only to the body. This expression refers to the deceased Messiah. Thou wilt not leave him among the dead, thou wilt raise him up."

Now what shall we say respecting the stress which Mr. Barnes puts upon the use of the word souls, ψυχας, in his notes on Rev. xx. 4? The same word is used here that was used in Acts, and which is the Greek word used by the inspired writer to translate the Hebrew word which means soul, and respecting which our author remarks there is no clear instance in which it is applied to the soul in a separate state, or disjoined from the body." And is "there no ambiguity?" Then we must suppose the apostle John saw the souls of those who had been beheaded united with risen bodies. Again if the phrase, "thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," means thou wilt not leave "me among the dead;" but wilt "raise me up;" then what forbids that we are to understand the apostle John to say, I saw those who had been beheaded, &c., and they lived; that is, those who had been put to death were raised to life again? Again, since the resurrection of our Saviour was declared by the expression—Thou wilt not leave my "*soul*" in hell, why is it inappropriate to describe the resurrection of his followers by saying, "I saw the souls of those who had been beheaded and they lived?" Here we discover a very manifest propriety in the use of the word "souls" in the passage before us.

Again, Mr. Barnes's interpretation of the text implies that the language, when taken in its obvious sense, describes a literal resurrection. He supposes that it teaches that these will live on the earth in a body possessing the spirit of the martyrs. He says it will be "as if the martyrs were raised up from the dead;" as "if the most eminent saints were raised again from the dead;" as "if they were raised from the dead, or which might be represented by a resurrection from the dead." Now if the language would not appropriately describe

a resurrection of the martyrs, and that too from the dead, how will it be "as if" they were? If the symbol is not given, how does he know what is symbolized? How does he know that men will live in the time of the millennium so much like the martyrs, that it will be "as if" they were raised up from the dead, if the language does not describe, and cannot be made to describe a literal resurrection? The raising of souls or disembodied spirits, would be a very incongruous representation of men living in a body on the earth. Hence it appears that Mr. Barnes assumes that to be the literal meaning of the passage, which he affirms cannot be made out by the language in which it is expressed. Having made Mr. Barnes answer his own objections, we shall reserve remarks which we propose to make on a proper construction of the terms employed for another place.

Seventh objection:—

7. "If the first resurrection mean rising from the grave in immortal and glorified bodies, we do not need the assurance (ver. 6) that on such the second death hath no power—that is, that they would not perish for ever."

In answering this objection, we would say simply, that Mr. Barnes and our Saviour seem to have thought differently on the subject. In speaking of the resurrection he said, "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: *neither can they die any more.*"

Eighth objection:—

8. "In the whole passage there are but two classes of men referred to. There are those who have part in the first resurrection; that is, according to the supposition, *all* the saints; and there are those over whom the second death has no power. Into which of these classes are we to put the myriads of men having flesh and blood, who are to people the world during the millennium?"

What if we should put them in neither class? The text does not necessarily classify all who will ever live on the earth in this manner. It speaks only of those who will be raised. It says nothing about those who will be born

during the millennium, directly, indirectly, or impliedly, and from the phrase in question, perhaps, it could not be inferred that any would be born during that period. What if it should please God to confer the same favor upon them, which he will confer upon those Christians who will be alive when he shall come, who will not be raised from the dead, nor will the second death have power over them? They will not sleep, that is die, but they will be changed. And what if Christ shall deal in like manner with those who are born during the millennium? Will it be anything to those who die in Christ, or to those who die in sin? or anything to what is said about them?

Ninth objection:—

9. "The mention of the time during which they are to reign, if it be literally understood, is contrary to the whole statement of the Bible in other places. They are to live and reign with Christ a thousand years. What then?"

This passage teaches that they shall reign with Christ a thousand years. We must look to what follows, and other parts of the Bible, to know what will be after the thousand years. The sacred writers usually treat of one thing at a time.

Tenth objection:—

10. "A further objection to this view is, that the wicked part of the world—the rest of the dead who lived not again, *until* the thousand years were finished, must of course be expected to live again in the same bodily sense, when those thousand years were finished. But so far from this, there is no mention of their living then."

Mr. Barnes has said the contrary to this in his notes on the text, and we think with reason. We shall let him answer himself: "The language here is not necessarily to be interpreted as meaning that they *would* be raised up then, whatever may be true on that point. It is merely an emphatic mode of affirming that *up to that time* they *would* not live in the sense in which it was affirmed that the others would live." We trust Mr. B. will be satisfied with this answer.

The eleventh objection has been already answered under another head.

Twelfth objection:—

12. "The fair statement in verses 11–15, is that all the dead will then be raised up and judged."

Millenarians would, of course, join issue with him on the interpretation of that passage. We suppose Mr. Barnes would not say that that passage affirms, that all who have ever died will be raised up at that time, but only that that is to be inferred from what is taught; consequently, this objection will need no further notice here.

Thirteenth objection:—

13. "This representation is wholly inconsistent, not only with verses 11–15, but with the uniform language of the Scriptures, that all the righteous and the wicked will be judged together, and both at the coming of Christ."

Yet Mr. Barnes admits two judgments. In his notes on "I saw thrones and they sat upon them," he refers to what our Saviour says in Matt. xix. 28, "When the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." He seems to think the judgment spoken of in verse 4, was not in relation to the whole race of mankind, but to the martyrs and to those, who, amidst temptation and trials, had kept themselves pure. In his analysis of the eleventh chapter, he uses the following language:—"The nations had been angry, but the time had now come when a judgment was to be pronounced on the dead, and when due reward was to be given to the servants of God, the prophets, and the saints, and those who feared his name, small and great, in the establishment of a permanent kingdom and the complete triumph of the true religion in the world." If what is here said does not contradict the Scriptures respecting the judgment, we cannot conceive how the fact that the saints will be raised up at the commencement of the millennium, contradicts what is elsewhere taught. The very act of raising up the righteous dead at that time will be an act of judgment or discrimination, which, instead of contradicting, would foreshadow the final judgment. As the Scriptures speak of two judgments, we are to suppose some passages refer to one and some to the

other. And this unquestionably is true of the passages referred to by our author.

We designed in our conclusion to show that the resurrection described in Rev. xx. 4–6, cannot be a resurrection of souls which had never died; nor the reviving of the spirit of the martyrs in persons living in mortal and dying bodies; as the description is of those who are raised in a glorified state, reigning with Christ, and who, of course, cannot be a type of sinful men in mortal and dying bodies; and also, that none others than the saints in a glorified state can be designated, since they only, and not men in a state of trial and in mortal bodies, will be companions of Christ in his glorious reign. But our space will not allow us to extend the discussion. We had also designed to show what we regard as the true construction of the passage, but we postpone it to a future occasion.

Art. III.—The Princeton Review on Millenarianism.

By the Editor.

The author of the article in the Princeton Repertory for January last, on "Modern Millenarianism," states it as his object to consider the millenarian doctrine "in contrast with the general one," by laying "side by side the two theories of Christ's advent,—viz. the one which locates it before, and the one which locates it after the millennium, and thus bring to view the principal points of difference." This implies that he meant to give an adequate and impartial exhibition of both, and to point out the grounds and the difficulties of the one, as fully and fairly as of the other. His article, however, answers but very imperfectly to that promise. He makes no direct statement whatever of the principles of interpretation on which the antimillenarians proceed in their theory; he utters nothing in respect to the differing and contradictory views which they entertain on almost all the topics which it touches; he says not a word of the nume-

rous and hitherto unanswerable objections with which their scheme is embarrassed. He contents himself with simply stating a few of its main points, and assuming that it is correct, passes over and conceals the fact that no agreement exists among its supporters in respect to any one of its elements; that it is founded on principles of construction which its abettors themselves reject and denounce when applied to the doctrinal and historical Scriptures; that it has no direct support from the sacred word; and that it is in open contradiction to many of the most explicit prophecies of Christ's coming and kingdom. Very different is the course he pursues in treating of the millenarian theory. There his main aim is to present what he regards as objectionable. He suppresses the proofs of its truth; he misrepresents it; he omits nothing he thinks he may safely utter, that is adapted to disgrace it, and lead his readers to regard it with prejudice and disgust. Instead of a fair exhibition of the two systems, his whole drift is to run down millenarianism by statements, assumptions, and intimations that are either sheer fabrications, or are made up in a large degree of misrepresentation, perversion, and caricature. His article is, in short, a mere attack on the doctrine of Christ's premillennial advent, and is, accordingly, so regarded by the Editor of the Repertory; and so heartily, that dropping the pretext under which the author attempts to veil its character, he announces in the note with which he introduces it, that he publishes it as a complete dissection of millenarianism. He says:—

"We published in a former number of our quarterly, an article on the missionary bearings of the millenarian doctrines. As these dogmas are making very high pretensions, and 'no small stir' in our days; and as many are beginning to wonder what these strange things mean, we have thought we could not render our readers a better service, than by attempting to set before them in a compact form, *an analysis of the entire millenarian creed.*"

It is thus, in the judgment of the Editor, an assault on the doctrine of Christ's speedy coming, and reign on the earth during the thousand years, designed to show off what he calls its "high pretensions," and to impress those who are "beginning to wonder what it means," and who are, there-

fore, essentially unacquainted with the subject, with such prepossessions that they may be induced to adhere to the opposite theory.

Though, however, it does not answer to its professions, and is a very uncandid and deceptive representation, it is, in some respects, less exceptionable than the article to which he refers on "the missionary bearings" of the doctrine, and than that in 1850 on Mr. Imbrie's discourse. There is no representation in the present article that the millenarian doctrine is "in its whole character Judaic," that it was "adopted bodily" by the early churches from the Jews, nor that it "conflicts with many well established doctrines of the word of God." There are no intimations that the earth, during the reign of Christ, is, according to the millenarian view, to resemble the sensual paradise of Mahomet. There is no denunciation of it as fatally hostile to missions or the ministry; and as it is presented as an analysis of *the entire millenarian creed*, this implies that those extraordinary misrepresentations are abandoned. This is somewhat encouraging. Such improvement, under candid and friendly criticism, indicates a possibility that these assailants may be led to relinquish other erroneous statements, and induces us to continue the discussion. Who knows but they may at length free themselves from misapprehension; and though they continue to differ from us, may bring their statements of the views entertained by millenarians into such harmony with fact, that there will cease to be any occasion to arraign them for misrepresentation or unfairness? In the hope of promoting this desirable result, we propose to animadvert on some of the statements of this article which need essential correction to bring them within the limits of truth.

Of these, one of the most extraordinary is the representation the writer gives of the principles of interpretation on which millenarians proceed. He says:—

"Millenarianism has grown out of a new school of Scripture interpretation; and its laws of interpretation are so different from the old, that the Bible may almost be said to wear a new visage and speak with a new tongue—a tongue not very intelligible, in many of its utterances to the uninitiated. *The central law of interpretation by which millenarians profess always to be guided, is that of giving*

THE LITERAL SENSE. They call themselves literalists, in opposition to those who entertain the other notion of the millennium, whom they denominate spiritualists or allegorists, and whom they accuse of frittering away the sense of Scripture by following a system of figurative interpretation. *It is by following out rigidly (we may say doggedly) their system of literalism with reference to a portion of the prophetic Scriptures, that in defiance of all other Scripture, they bring in the future personal reign of Christ on the earth, and shape their entire view of the system of revealed religion to that nucleus.*"—P. 68.

Had it been the intention of the writer to frame an accusation that not only should not contain a single particle of truth, but that should present the most flagrant contradiction to fact; we know not how he could have penned one more palpably of that character, than the representation he here gives of the "law of interpretation by which millenarians profess always to be guided." The meaning of the statement that that law "*is that of giving the literal sense*," is that they "*always*" give that sense to the prophecies which relate to Christ's coming, without any regard to the fact that a portion of them are conveyed through symbols, and that others abound in rhetorical figures, which require to be interpreted as such in order to give their true sense. His representation is, therefore, equivalent to that unfortunately made by Dr. Spring, from whom it is not improbably borrowed, that millenarians "affirm that the prophetic and apocalyptical writings which speak of the millennium, are FREE *from figures and symbols, and are altogether literal*," and that "on this assumption rests the whole hypothesis of the premillennial advent."

That this charge is not only wholly groundless, but the direct converse of fact so far as we are concerned, our readers cannot need to be told. One great object in all our discussions on the subject has been, first to ascertain what the criteria are by which the symbolic prophecies are to be distinguished from those of which language is the medium, and what the principles are on which they are to be explained. Next, what the peculiarities are of the several figures of speech; how they are to be discriminated from literal language; and what the laws are by which they are to be interpreted.

Thirdly, to show that the laws of symbols are to be applied only to symbols; and the laws of the several figures only to their respective figures; and that all other language is to be construed according to its nature as literal. And finally, to apply these laws of interpretation to the prophecies, especially the Apocalypse, Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Isaiah, and show what the results are to which they lead. Yet in the face of this fact, of which this writer was unquestionably aware, and with a special reference to us, as his whole article indicates, he ventures to assert without reserve or qualification that "the central law of interpretation by which millenarians profess *always* to be guided, is that of giving the literal sense," and that "it is by following out rigidly —we might say doggedly—their system of literalism, that they bring in the future personal reign of Christ on earth." It is equivalent, therefore, to the assertion that we do not recognise the existence in those prophecies of either any symbols or figures, but maintain that they are throughout to be interpreted by the laws of literal language! The man who ventures to utter such a proposition, we think will not be likely to be envied for his accuracy or prudence. If Dr. Spring put forth the misrepresentation without considering how effectively it could be disproved, this writer, since our reply to him, can have no such excuse. He must be regarded, we take it, as making the statement with a perfect knowledge of its character, and the facility with which it can be confuted.

But it is a most inexcusable misrepresentation also of those millenarians who have denominated themselves *literalists*, as was shown in our response to Dr. Spring. They do not use the phrase "literal interpretation," to denote an interpretation of the prophecies in disregard of their symbols and figures, and on the assumption not only that they are conveyed altogether through language, but language without tropes. Instead, they employ the expression to denote precisely the reverse, that the prophecies are to be interpreted by the proper laws of the medium through which they are revealed;—those which are symbolical, by the laws of symbols, and those which are embodied solely in language, by the genuine and natural laws of their language;—if figurative, therefore, according to the laws of their figures;—if without

figures, according to the laws of untropical speech. They maintain, accordingly, that the sense which is educed from the prophecies when thus construed, is their true prophetic sense: and they use the phrase, simply for the purpose of distinguishing their method of interpretation from that of the antimillenarian or spiritualistic school, who maintain that the meaning of the prophecies which is obtained by that method of interpretation is not their predictive sense, but instead is a mere *representative* of that sense, which they hold is a wholly different and mystical one. This was shown at large in our reply to Dr. Spring, and might be shown again by a multitude of proofs. It will be enough to cite one or two. Thus Dr. Duffield says of the two "antagonistical systems:" "They may be designated *the literal and the spiritual.* By the literal we understand that which assumes the literality or historical *reality of the events predicted*, and resorts to the grammatical interpretation of the language of prophecy to determine its meaning." *The language* is thus, according to him, to be interpreted by the laws of grammar, which universally recognise and treat figures, and figures alone, as figures; and the events which are expressed by the language as thus interpreted, are considered as the identical events that are predicted, and that are verified, or are to be verified, in history. On the other hand, he says: "By *the spiritual*, we understand that which assumes *the spirituality of the events predicted;* it traces something *analogous*, it may be, to the literal, but entirely different from it, and peculiar, of which the literal may be employed as the representative, or allegorical exhibition." By "the spiritual," is thus meant a mode of interpretation by which the events that are signified by the language, when taken in its grammatical sense, are not regarded as the events that are really predicted, but only *the representatives* of those events, which are held to be of a different and mystical or spiritual nature.

The same view is given of the meaning of the terms by Mr. M'Neile. He says:

"The language of the prophets is often, almost always, figurative in some degree; but *the events* predicted, are not the less on that account *literal events*. When the Holy Ghost spake by the mouth of Zechariah, saying, 'Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be

scattered,' the language was figurative, our Lord not being literally a shepherd, neither his disciples sheep. But the event [the smiting] predicted in that figurative language, was a literal event; and to the matter of fact as it occurred in Gethsemane, the prophecy is applied by St. Matthew xxvi. 31. It is therefore no objection to the literal interpretation which I advocate, to say that the prophetic language is figurative. I admit that it is so; sometimes highly so. The question is, what do the figures mean? Do they mean other figures, or do they mean facts? My opinion is, that facts are the legitimate themes of prophecy."—*Lectures on the Prospects of the Jews*, Preface, p. i.

Here the meaning of "the literal interpretation," which he advocates, is simply that *the events* signified by the figurative and other language of the prophets, when interpreted by its proper laws, are to be taken as the identical events that are predicted by them; not, as the allegorists maintain, that the events expressed in the language are the mere symbols or representatives of a different and mystical class, which they regard as the real and only events that are foreshown.

It is on this ground accordingly that he frames his argument for the restoration of the Israelites. As the Israelites are indisputably, by the laws of philology, the subjects of the prophecies which treat of their return to their land, he maintains that they, and they only, are the people whom those prophecies concern, and in whom they are to have their fulfilment; and as those predictions, taken in their grammatical sense, as unquestionably denote their actual restoration to their ancient land, he maintains that that, and that alone, is the event which they foreshow. In other words, it is the philological sense of those prophecies, taken as they are with their numerous figures, which he denominates their literal, that is their real sense, and contends is their true and only predictive meaning. This reviewer's representation is thus totally unauthorized and unjust in respect to those millenarians who have entitled themselves literalists, as well as to us. It is a point-blank and specific denial of the identical characteristic of their mode of interpretation, which they employ the term literal to express.

How now is it that he ventures, in the face of this fact, to repeat this stale and oft confuted accusation, and yet leaves those readers of the Repertory, who, according to the Editor,

are "beginning to wonder what these things mean," and are therefore in a condition to be misled, without a hint that it is altogether disowned by millenarians, and has been amply shown by them to be wholly groundless and unjust? That he was sensible that that is its character, so far as we are concerned, no one can doubt; as he refers to the Journal repeatedly, and indicates throughout that he is aware what the views of interpretation are that are advocated in it. Nor do we see how it can be that he was not aware that that is its character also in regard to those who style themselves literalists; as he appears to have read that part of our article in reply to Dr. Spring which respects them, and states nearly in the words we employed, that they use that term to distinguish themselves from the antimillenarians whom they denominate "spiritualists or allegorists." We are moreover precluded from assuming that he fell into the misrepresentation from a want of knowledge. We had, in candor and courtesy, supposed that that was the cause of the extraordinary misstatements and errors of our opponents, which we have from time to time had occasion to point out. But he receives that intimation with extreme offence. Nothing excites him to higher indignation, than the hint that the errors of his party have their origin in ignorance.

Are we then to regard him as having put forth this erroneous and calumniatory statement with a knowledge that that is its character? And is it to be inferred that his code of ethics is such that he considers himself justified in making groundless and unjust statements when they may subserve his purpose for the moment? Such he may be assured is the judgment that will be likely to be formed, not only by those whom he misrepresents, but by all the honorable also among antimillenarians. We see not indeed how one who, in the condition in which he *appears* to have written, ventures publicly to allege that "the central law of interpretation by which" we and other "millenarians profess always to be guided, is that of giving the literal sense," and that "it is by following out rigidly" and "doggedly," such a "system of literalism," that we and they "bring in the future personal reign of Christ on earth," can reasonably be considered as acting with upright intentions. On the one hand, the fact here denied is certainly as indisputable and as conspicuous,

as the fact is that we have expressed any opinion on the subject; while on the other hand, the plea of ignorance is specifically disclaimed. How then can the denial be presumed to have been made in the belief that it was true? What were it but an offence against rectitude to put on it such a construction?

Our object, however, in thus pushing the inquiry respecting the motive of the misrepresentation, is not to force our readers to a conclusion against its author, or divest any of the objections he offers to our views, of any share of the weight to which they are fairly entitled; but it is solely to show him what the result will inevitably be if this system of misrepresentation and detraction is continued. He cannot take a more direct course either to discredit his cause, or to divest himself of the confidence of the fair-minded of his own party. If millenarianism is such an exorbitant error as he maintains, he should be able to confute it by the truth; he should feel it to be as unnecessary as it is dishonorable, to resort to such fiction and misrepresentation for the purpose.

II. Our next objection to his article is, that he omits to give a statement of the theory of interpretation on which he and his party proceed. This was certainly necessary in order to a contrast of the two systems. He says, however, nothing specifically on the subject, but leaves his readers to infer, from the vehemence with which he denounces the theory he ascribes to millenarians, that he and his antimillenarian friends hold that the prophecies are to be interpreted according to the nature of the media through which they are made; those that are symbolical, by the laws of symbols; and those that are conveyed through language, by the laws of that language, according as it is figurative, or otherwise. This, however, is the very reverse of the fact; as these are identically the views held by millenarians which he rejects with so much scorn. In order to see what the principles are on which he and his party found their construction of the prophecies, we must consider what the specific laws are that are advocated by us, which he thus disowns and denounces. The antimillenarian laws are their direct opposite.

In the first place then, we maintain, that the symbolic prophecies are clearly distinguishable from those which are conveyed solely through language, and are to be interpreted by

laws that are founded on the nature of symbols, and are peculiar to themselves. This proposition the reviewer, in denouncing our system, denounces and rejects.

In the second place, we maintain that the great principles on which symbols are used, are indicated in the inspired interpretations of them that are given in the prophecies themselves; and that those principles should be taken as a guide in the interpretation of all others. This proposition, in rejecting the system of which it is a cardinal element, he also discards.

In the third place, we maintain, and show by an analysis of the passages, that, according to those inspired interpretations, symbolic agents always represent agents, not abstract qualities, attributes, acts, or effects; that acts symbolize acts, qualities qualities, conditions conditions, and effects effects. In denying the truth of the system, he in like manner denies this.

In the fourth place, we maintain, that the symbols generally denote agents and objects of a class that differ from themselves, but that bear to them a strong resemblance; and that the reason of the exceptions that occur is, that the agents or events they are employed to represent, are such in their nature or relations, that there are no analogous agents or events that can be used as their symbols. This, in rejecting the system, he also rejects.

His laws of symbolic interpretation then, being the reverse of those, when expressed in a positive form, are:—

1. That there is no difference in the media through which the symbolic and the unsymbolic prophecies are made, but that the persons, acts, and events presented in the language predictions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Malachi, Christ, Paul, and Peter, are used as mere representatives of others, as much as the symbolic agents and objects are of the visions of Daniel and John.

2. That the interpretations given by the Holy Spirit of many of the symbols in the prophecies themselves, do not present any exemplification of the principles on which they are used; and that they cannot be taken as authoritative guides in the interpretation of the others.

3. That in those inspired interpretations, the symbolic agents are not explained as representing agents, in distinc-

tion from qualities, acts, or effects; nor acts as denoting acts, conditions conditions, and effects effects.

4. And finally, that these interpreted symbols do not generally represent agents, acts, or events, of a different class from themselves; and that when symbols represent agents or events of their own order, it is not because there is not anything besides that could properly symbolize them.

As these are the converse of the propositions which he rejects, they must be taken as the principles which he and his party positively maintain; and they are accordingly in fact the identical principles on which they proceed and make the basis of their theory of the millennium. Thus in their construction of the numerous predictions of the restoration of the Israelites, they proceed on the assumption that there is no distinction in the media of prediction between the symbolic and the unsymbolical prophecies; and treat the Israelites, Zion, Jerusalem, and the acts and events that are predicated of them, as mere representatives of the Christian church, or body of Gentile believers, and acts and events of which they are to be the subjects. They do not regard the interpretations of prophetic symbols given by the Holy Spirit, as indicating the principle on which they are employed. Not one of the writers who have assailed our views of interpretation, has excepted that law from his objections, or recognised its legitimacy. Not one of the anti-millenarians who has published expositions of the Apocalypse or Daniel since that was first stated by us as a law, has either directly acknowledged or tacitly taken it as a guide in his interpretations. There is not one of them probably, who has looked far enough to see what the results are to which it leads, that is not aware that to adopt it as a rule, would be to overturn his whole system of explication. In like manner they frame a great number of their interpretations on their third law, that symbolic agents do not uniformly represent agents, acts acts, events events; but they often treat symbolic actors as denoting acts, effects, or qualities, in place of agents; and acts, events, and qualities as denoting agents, conditions, or effects that bear no analogy to themselves. Thus they very generally interpret the horsemen of the seals as denoting mere conquest, war, famine, pestilence, and death, instead of agents of a class bearing a resem-

blance to the symbols, acting a part in their peculiar sphere, analogous to that of their representatives in theirs. They hold in like manner that Christ's coming with his hosts and destroying the wild beast and the armies, Rev. xix. 11–21, is no representation of his personal coming; but only of certain acts or events of his providence by which the antichristian powers are to be conquered and reduced to the minority; and they interpret the first resurrection, chap. xx. 4–6, where a real resurrection is the symbol, as representing not a resurrection of bodies, but only a production of principles or characteristics in the living by regeneration. And finally, they proceed in a great number of their interpretations on the assumption of their fourth law, that there are no criteria by which it can be known that symbols either do or do not represent agents or objects of a different species from themselves. Thus, they sometimes expound the horsemen of the seals as symbolizing warriors and oppressors, simply because they are themselves warriors and tyrants; and sometimes as denoting war, oppression, and famine, instead of agents who are the authors of those effects. They sometimes interpret the witnesses as symbolizing human witnesses, and sometimes as representing the Scriptures which the witnesses make the ground of their testimony. They sometimes regard Babylon as symbolizing Rome, a real city like itself; sometimes as denoting the civil government of which Rome was the capital; and sometimes as representing the Papacy of which that city is the seat. And finally, they sometimes construe a resurrection of the dead as denoting a mere renovation of men, and production in them of certain characteristic principles; and sometimes as signifying a literal reviviscence of the dead from their graves. Their great principles of symbolic interpretation are thus altogether groundless, in open contradiction to the Scriptures and to the laws of analogy, and in the utmost degree arbitrary, and make the exposition of the symbols a mere work of fancy and conjecture, and would, were they adhered to, infallibly lead to error. The expositions of anti-millenarians approach to the truth, only just in proportion as they desert and contravene their own principles.

Their views of the laws by which figurative and proper language is to be interpreted are equally mistaken and ab-

surd. The first great law which we have advanced on that branch of hermeneutics is, that no passages are to be considered figurative, except those which actually have figures in them. In rejecting our system, the reviewer rejects that.

The next great law is, that in figurative expressions, the agent, object, or nominative to which the figure is applied, is always used in its proper or literal sense; and that the figure accordingly is confined wholly to the predicate of the proposition, or that which is affirmed or declared of the nominative. As in the expressions, God is a rock, life is a vapor, time flies, the clouds weep,—the nominatives God, life, time, and clouds, are used in their proper untropical signification; and the figures lie wholly in the use of the nouns and verbs that are applied to them. This, in denying the system, he also denies.

The third great law is, that each figure has a nature of its own that distinguishes it from all others; that each is used on a principle that accords with its nature; and that each is to be interpreted by its proper laws. This, in rejecting the system, he also rejects.

His laws of interpretation, therefore, stated directly are:

1. That figures are not necessary in a passage, in order to constitute it figurative.

2. That in metaphors and other figurative propositions, the figure is not confined to the predicate of the proposition, but includes the nominative, or that to which the figure is applied, as well as the tropical expression itself which is applied to it.

3. That figures have no specific nature that is peculiar to them, and that they are not to be interpreted by laws that accord with their nature, and are peculiar to themselves.

And these laws, accordingly, he and his party make the basis of the constructions they put on a great number of the language prophecies. Thus, on the ground of their first law, they treat a great multitude of passages as figurative that have no specific figure in them. For example, Matthew xxiv. 30, "And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory," they generally regard as metaphorical, and hold that the coming there foreshown,

instead of a personal visible coming of Christ, is only an analogous act or dispensation of his providence; and yet, on the ground of their second law, they maintain that Christ, of whom the coming in the clouds is predicated, is not to be the real subject of that coming, but holding that he, as well as the advent that is predicted, is used figuratively, they maintain that his providence or his agency as the ruler of the world, is the real subject of the predicted advent. And, finally, on the ground of their third law, instead of interpreting him and that which is predicated of him, according to the nature of the metaphor, they maintain that he and his coming in the clouds, are mere representatives of his providence and its acts, and are to be interpreted, therefore, by the laws of symbols instead of the laws of language. In like manner, the prediction, Isaiah ii. 1, 2, "It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and exalted above the hills," they, according to their first law, pronounce to be figurative, although there is no figure in it. Next, on the ground of their second law, they assume that the nominative of the prediction, "the mountain of the Lord's house," is used by a figure, as well as that which is affirmed of it; and yet, finally, in conformity with their third law, instead of interpreting the prediction by the laws of the metaphor, they treat the nominative and that which is predicated of it as mere representatives, and expound them as though the one were a symbol of the Christian church, and the other of the prosperity of which that church is to be the subject; and so of innumerable other passages. And it is this treatment of the language prophecies, as though they were representative or allegorical, that is what they themselves call the spiritualization of the predictions, and is the reason that they are denominated spiritualists and allegorists.

This branch of their system of interpretation is thus as false and preposterous as the other. It empties the Scriptures, just as far as it is adhered to, of their true significance, makes their meaning to depend on the whim or fancy of the expositor, and puts it in his power to deduce from them any view of the past or the future that suits his wishes.

Such are the two systems of interpretation. Why, now, if

the reviewer meant to deal fairly with his readers, did he not present them in their true character, and show their antagonism to each other at every point? Why, on the one hand, did he frame the grossest and most inexcusable misrepresentation of the principles on which we proceed that his ingenuity could invent, and use every artifice in his power to lead the unsuspecting to receive his statement as true? And why, on the other hand, did he conceal from them the absurd and unscriptural principles on which he and his party proceed in their interpretations, and leave it to be assumed that they are precisely the reverse of what they are? Was he unwilling that the truth should be known in regard to the two systems? Was he apprehensive, that if he stated the laws on which we proceed in our interpretations, plainly and directly as we are accustomed to state them, his readers would be likely to be struck with their apparent truth, and be induced to examine, adopt, and apply them? Was he afraid, if he drew the mask from his own, and exhibited them in their naked deformity, that the public would recoil from them with a resistless conviction that they are false, and can only lead to a total perversion of the sacred word? If these had been his views and feelings, the course he has pursued is undoubtedly such as might naturally have been expected. It is not such however, we take it, as a fair-minded man would choose. Do thorns grow on the vine or olive, or thistles on the fig-tree?

III. If the course he has pursued in respect to the laws of interpretation is adapted to make so unfavorable an impression in regard to him, what conclusions shall we draw from the misrepresentations to which he has resorted of the views millenarians entertain of Christ's regal and priestly office, in which he charges on them a theory that is universally rejected by them, and is held exclusively by persons of his own party! He says,

"We have studied out and embraced a scheme of Christian faith which connects the kingly office of Christ inseparably with his mediatorial relations; we believe that as Mediator from first to last, he as really and as necessarily executed the office of king as of priest. We believe the Scriptures plainly teach that Christ is now king in

Zion; that his mediatorial kingdom has already commenced on earth in the hearts of his people, and is to be perfected and perpetuated through everlasting ages in the world to come. Jesus himself, in answer to Pilate's inquiry, confessed that he was their king, that for the purpose of wearing that character he was born. *Yet the whole millenarian theory is built upon the assumption that Christ as Mediator, is not king—that he is now reigning upon his Father's throne, not his own—that his proper kingdom is to commence with the Millennium, and is of course yet future; that the present is the priestly age of Christ—the age yet to come, before entering upon which he will have finished the work of intercession, is his kingly age.*"—P. 69.

As to the charge that millenarians hold that Christ is not now a king; and that "their whole theory is built on the assumption that he as *Mediator* is not king;" we have already confuted it, at length, in our review of Mr. Brown (Journal, vol. iii. pp. 565–595), and again in our reply to the former article of the Repertory (vol. iv. pp. 251–255); and we ask our readers to reperuse those answers, and especially the last, that they may see what the conditions are in which this writer reproduces these misrepresentations, and what the spirit is with which he is animated. It is there shown not only that millenarians entertain no such notion; that they hold as distinctly and emphatically as their antagonists do, that Christ is now king; but the most ample proofs are furnished that the great doctrine they teach that Christ is at his second coming to be invested with the dominion of the earth, establish his kingdom in it, and reign as its king in a new form, gives no ground whatever for the charge that they hold, either directly or indirectly, that he has not now a kingdom here, and is not now its king: and among these proofs are not only explicit passages of Scripture and the Westminster catechism, but the Princeton Repertory also, in which, in the notice of Mr. Imbrie's Discourse, the Editor states it as his own and the belief generally of the church, that at Christ's second advent, he is to establish his kingdom in a new form, and exercise over it a new or different administration: "The kingdom of Christ is *then* to be *established*, not for a thousand years, but for ever. It is not "thereafter, to be an earthly, but a heavenly kingdom." If then, as is thus distinctly held by all parties, the kingdom of Christ is

to undergo important changes, and be established in a new form at that epoch, the belief entertained by millenarians that it is then to be established on earth, no more proves or implies a denial that he is now king, and is reigning as such, than the belief does, held by some antimillenarians, that heaven is to be the scene in which it is then to be established. How does the doctrine that Christ is to come from heaven to earth to reign over his kingdom, any more prove or imply that he is not now a king, and has not a kingdom; than the doctrine that he is then to transfer his kingdom from earth to heaven, proves directly, or by implication, that he is not now a king, and has not a kingdom? But the cool injustice of the reviewer's allegation is seen from the fact that it is not peculiar to millenarians to hold that the earth is to be the scene of the kingdom Christ is to establish at his coming. That is equally the belief also of a large portion of antimillenarians.

The reviewer is thus guilty of reproducing an accusation which is not only wholly baseless, and in direct contradiction to the well known belief of millenarians, but is founded on grounds that are common to millenarians and antimillenarians, and renders him and his party as obnoxious to the charge of denying that Christ is now a king, as on his representation the millenarians are!

But if in imputing this doctrine to millenarians the reviewer is guilty of a gross and unpardonable misrepresentation, what are we to say of his statement that they hold that "the present is" exclusively "the priestly age of Christ," and that "before entering upon" "the age to come," "he will have finished the work of intercession"—a doctrine that instead of being held by millenarians is specifically rejected by them, and is entertained solely by antimillenarians, or a portion of them, and is a conspicuous and essential element of their theory! If anything can brand this writer with the discredit of a "wretched superficiality," or a "deplorable degradation" of principle, we think this must. Millenarians do not countenance any such notion. No one of their number, so far as we are aware, has ever advanced it. This writer does not attempt to prove that it is taught by them. He gives no authority for his assertion. If he had any evidences of its truth, why did he not produce them? Nor do

the views millenarians entertain of Christ's reign on the earth, imply that he is not then to exercise his office as Mediator and Intercessor. Instead, the continuance of his office as Mediator and Intercessor is necessarily involved in the continuance which they anticipate of the work of redemption during that period. They accordingly hold the Scriptural doctrine, that he is "a priest *for ever*," that he has "an unchangeable priesthood," and that "he for ever can save those who come unto God by him, because he ever lives to make intercession for them." We may safely call upon the reviewer to point to one of their number who maintains any other view than this.

But while it is in direct antagonism to the views of millenarians, it is an element of the theory held by at least a portion of their opponents the antimillenarians, and is boldly and zealously maintained by them.

Thus it is advanced by Mr. Brown, of Glasgow, Scotland, in his volume on Christ's second coming, very generally commended by the antimillenarian press, on its republication here, and so highly approved, that if report spoke true, the diploma of Doctor of Divinity with which the author was honored by Nassau Hall, was conferred as an expression of the high estimate in which the work is there held. Thus his fourth proposition is, that

> "The intercession of Christ, and the work of the Spirit, for saving purposes, will cease at the second advent. Christ's intercession . . . . stands *intermediate* between his first and his second coming." . . . . "The two advents stand at the two extremities of Christ's *mediatorial work*, while the intercession stretches from one to the other, and occupies the whole intervening period." . . . . "As the second coming is . . . . represented as crowning the whole purposes of the first, it is plain that the intercession, which is but a continual pleading upon the merit of his death, must be over for all saving purposes before he comes." . . . . "When the advent arrives, the intercession is done, and when the intercession is done, salvation is done. When Christ appears the second time *to us*, he will cease to appear in the presence of God *for us*."—Pp. 117–119.

The doctrine that Christ's intercessions are to cease at his second coming is thus the doctrine of the great antimillena-

rian champion of the day, whose work was hailed with so much eagerness and exultation by the party here, and rewarded with a diploma of Doctor of Divinity; and is the doctrine of that party alone. In our review of his volume, instead of countenancing, we refuted it, by showing its contradictoriness to the Scriptures, which exhibit Christ's priesthood as unchangeable, and his intercessions as to continue for ever. How happened it now, that the reviewer, with these facts before him—for he undoubtedly drew his idea that Christ's priestly office is to terminate at his second advent from Mr. Brown—ventured to turn round, and charge on us and other millenarians this false and monstrous dogma, which is held exclusively by himself and his party? Has antimillenarianism sunk to such a "deplorable degradation" that its advocates feel it to be necessary to resort to such an extraordinary measure to discredit their opponents? How happened it that the Editor of the Repertory gave his sanction to this extraordinary calumny by inserting it in his pages? He at least had the most ample means of knowing that that is its character; and in an instance like this, in which the object of the article is to discredit opponents by reproachful statements and sinister insinuations, and the name of the author is meant to be concealed, we see not how he can shield himself from responsibility for the misrepresentation. And can such a procedure meet the approbation of antimillenarians generally? Can prejudice and party spirit have gained such an ascendency among them, that they are prepared to sanction such an expedient to produce a momentary impression against the advocates of Christ's premillennial advent, and check the spread of their views? It cannot be. That there are among them restless and ambitious individuals, who, to subserve their personal and party purposes, may be ready to resort to such means, need not be doubted. But no error can be greater than to imagine that such a course can meet their approval generally. This writer will find he is mistaken if he flatters himself that the misrepresentations in which he has indulged are to secure him the applause of a single individual in the party whose approbation can be of any value. Such men do not hold the Jesuitical doctrine that the end justifies the means. They do not regard misrepresentation

and deception as the proper instruments of promoting the truth. Nor are they averse to a discussion of the subject. So far from it, large numbers of them, it is within our knowledge, wish for a fair and effective exhibition of the question in all its relations, that they may be able to form an impartial and final judgment respecting it. Instead of conciliating their confidence therefore, it makes on them a most adverse impression, to find that the leaders on their side cannot be trusted; that, until their statements have been canvassed, no assurance can be felt that they are not disfigured by the most inexcusable blunders, and disgraced by the most audacious misrepresentations! And such will be the effect of this writer's assault. As its untruthfulness and injustice become known, it will recoil on its author and his party with the force of a thunderbolt, and contribute to dash down the tottering fabric it was meant to support.

IV. From this extraordinary misrepresentation, he proceeds "to consider the means of introducing" the millennium, and states it as his belief, "that *the present agencies for spreading the gospel* are the only means ever to be employed in converting the world to God." In this he unfortunately confounds the agencies for spreading the gospel with the gospel itself, which is spread by those agencies. He admits, however, that "the word is ever to be the instrument, the Almighty Spirit the agent, in the conversion of men." And he represents that millenarians maintain that means of a wholly different kind are at Christ's coming to be made the instruments of conversion. But here again the fact stated by millenarians that the truth is then to be brought home to the minds of men in conditions better suited to strike them, overcome their unbelief, and rouse them to a sense of their condition, he mistakes for a statement that other means besides the truth are then to be used for that purpose. Millenarians, however, entertain no such doctrine. They hold that truth is the only instrument by which men are ever to be convinced or sanctified; and that the Holy Spirit is the only agent who is to convince, renew, and sanctify them through that instrumentality. And this the reviewer expressly admits in the very paragraph in which he charges them with holding the opposite belief! Why, then, does he utter this accusation, unless his aim is at all

hazards to make them the objects of prejudice and aversion? The fact that Christ is to come in the clouds visibly, be seen of men, and assert his rights, and verify the promises, threatenings, and predictions of his word, in such a form as to produce in all a resistless conviction of his deity, his dominion, his righteousness, their guilt and ruin, and the necessity of instant submission to him, does not imply surely that if they are led by the Spirit of God to repentance, faith, and love under the impression of these great realities, the truths which are thus vividly and resistlessly flashed on them, are not the instrument which the Spirit will use in effecting their regeneration. This accusation betrays, in our judgment, a singular confusion of ideas, and springs, awful as the terms are to our critic, either from downright "ignorance," "wretched superficiality," or, what we think immeasurably more discreditable, a "deplorable degradation" of principle. A tolerable share of knowledge, discrimination, and candor would have prevented the repetition of a charge that is so obviously at war with fact, and that has been so often refuted.

He holds, however, that the nations are to be converted gradually, and by the spread of the gospel through the agencies alone that are now employed for the purpose; and thinks that Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the image, as interpreted by Daniel, seems to teach the same thing. He says:—

"The image denotes the kingdoms of this world that are to be destroyed before the glories of the millennium can be reached. Now what is to destroy those kingdoms? The kingdom of Christ, all say; The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom that shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. The kingdom too, all admit, is that stone cut out of the mountain without hands. But these admissions concede to us all we claim on the subject. For (1) this stone is cut out without hands; (2) it grows till it fills the whole earth; both denoting, like the leaven, the silent operation of *gospel grace* in regenerating the world; and (3) the God of heaven was to set up his kingdom in the days of those kingdoms it was to demolish; which proves that the kingdom of Christ was to have its commencement before the millennium, and that it was by its *growth* and powerful sway that the millennial state was to be brought in."—P. 71.

A singular confusion of ideas again. He plainly supposes that the power represented by the stone which destroyed the image, is identically the same as the converted nations who are to be the subjects of Christ's kingdom. But that is a total mistake. As the image does not represent the nations that were the subjects of the Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman monarchies, but the supreme rulers who exercised authority over those nations; so the stone does not symbolize the converted nations, or people who are to be the subjects of Christ's kingdom, but the persons who are to destroy the power represented by the toes of the image, and are therefore to exercise authority over the believing nations; and they are the risen and glorified saints, not those in the natural body. This is seen from the fact that the armies of heaven who are to attend Christ when he comes to destroy the wild beast and his armies, Rev. xix. 11—representing the same powers as the toes of the image—are dressed in white robes which are the badge of the glorified saints; and from the fact that at the resurrection of the holy dead at the commencement of the millennium, Rev. xx. 4–6, that judgment is to be given to the risen saints, which it is foretold in the vision, Dan. vii., of the destruction of the wild-beast, is at that epoch to be given to the saints of the Most High. It is the glorified saints therefore, who are symbolized by the stone, and who are to become kings unto God and Christ, and extend their sway through the whole earth; and this is confirmed by the representation that the stone which symbolizes them was cut out of the mountain without hands; for as that means that it was cut out without any human or creature agency, by the direct act of God, it shows that the saints whom it represents, are to be prepared for the act of destroying the image—not by human agencies, such as are now exerted in spreading the gospel, and bringing men to the knowledge of its truth, but by the direct act of God. That God has a kingdom in the earth anterior to the destruction of the image, does not prove surely, as this critic assumes, that the nations are to be converted and made the subjects of the glorified saints, before that destruction takes place. Nor does the prediction that *after* the annihilation of the image, they are to extend their sway through the whole earth, and that after the judgment and destruction of the ten-horned

wild beast, "the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the saints of the Most High," prove that the nations of the earth are to be gradually converted through the agencies now employed for the spread of the gospel, anterior to the fall of the wild beast, and their reception of the dominion of the earth. On what extraordinary logical processes this writer founds his conclusions?

But "what," he asks, "say our millenarian brethren on this subject? They maintain that previous to the millennium, the moral condition of the world is to receive no substantial improvement, but rather that things are to wax worse, until the measure of the world's iniquity is full." And have they not the most ample scriptural authority for that representation? Does not the interpretation given by the Spirit of the vision, Dan. vii., of the career of the ten-horned beast, expressly declare that the power denoted by that symbol shall make war upon the saints, prevail against them, and wear them out, until the Ancient of days comes, and judgment is given to the saints of the Most High, and the time comes that they possess the kingdom? And does not the vision show that that is to be the time when the Son of Man is to come in the clouds of heaven and be invested with dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him? Does not Christ himself foreshow that the tribulation of the Israelites is to continue from the fall of Jerusalem to the time of his coming in the clouds of heaven; and that at that epoch, the nations, instead of being converted, are to be regardless of him, as unbelieving and as worldly, as the antediluvians were at the flood; and as the inhabitants of Sodom were, when the storm of divine vengeance swept them to destruction? And does not the Apocalypse represent that the antichristian powers are to prevail, till the Son of God comes with his heavenly armies and destroys them; and that immediately thereafter, the risen saints are to be invested with kingly authority, and reign with him on the earth? The views entertained by millenarians are thus precisely those that are presented in the Scriptures; and what has this objector to oppose to their views? Nothing but assumptions and assertions that are without authority from the word of God.

V. In treating his next theme—"the state of things on the earth during the millennium,"—he confines himself to the views which are held, or which he states are held by millenarians, and makes it his object by impertinent questions, objections founded on ignorance, an exhibition of points in which they disagree, downright misrepresentation, and attempts at wit, to render the great doctrine of Christ's coming and millennial reign the object of disgust and ridicule. That his sneers are directed against the most specific and impressive teachings of the Saviour himself, does not seem in his judgment to detract at all from their propriety or piquancy; for Christ's annunciation that he is to come in the clouds of heaven, that he is to bring his saints with him, that he is to raise them from the dead, that he is to sit on the throne of his glory, and, gathering all nations before him, is to judge and destroy his enemies, and own and accept his friends and welcome them to his kingdom, are placed at the head of the catalogue of what he presents as millenarian extravagances, adapted to yield "gratification to a morbid and endless curiosity," and affects to lash with his feeble thong. After stating that in his view, "nothing is to distinguish the millennium from the present period, except the greater prevalence of true religion, and the various changes and blessings that are its natural accompaniments and consequents," he says—

> "But could we now break loose from our dull theory, and transmigrate into the millenarian idea, and venture for once to take its bold flights, we might promise to ourselves a rich reward for the excursion; at least *if the gratification of a morbid and endless curiosity* is of the nature of a reward. We should find ourselves very shortly set down upon a new world; and if we did not find there just what Paul found when he was caught up to the third heavens, we should certainly see things of which it is not possible to give men below an intelligible account.
>
> "What, then, according to the millenarians, is the anticipated state of things during the thousand years of Christ's personal reign on earth?"—P. 73.

And he answers this inquiry by enumerating Christ's great annunciations to which we have referred, and other explicit predictions respecting his coming and reign, and makes them the objects or the ground of the objections and

ridicule in which he indulges. Thus he says in reply to his question:

"The Son of God will descend visibly from heaven, attended by all the impressive display and insignia becoming his Divine royalty; he will be accompanied to earth by myriads of angels, and by the souls of the saints that had slept in him; the bodies of the saints will be raised and changed into bodies like Christ's glorious body; the angels will be dispersed through all the world to gather the wheat into the garner, and to gather the tares for burning."—Pp. 73, 74.

This is certainly an extraordinary procedure. After misrepresenting in the most flagrant manner the views entertained by millenarians on every topic he has hitherto treated, he now, to complete their overthrow, arraigns them as guilty of an absurd error in maintaining that Christ is to come in the clouds of heaven, raise his saints, and institute his millennial reign in the identical mode in which he has foreshown that these events are to take place; for we have his own testimony, and the testimony of his apostles, for each of the great acts that are here enumerated.

But perhaps it will be claimed that these events are not themselves the objects of the writer's ridicule, but simply the notion entertained by millenarians, that they are to precede and attend the introduction of the millennium. Nothing, however, is uttered by him indicating that it is in that relation that he contemplates them. He presents them as being themselves the objects of his sneers, and it is, in fact, on them or other events that are predicted with equal clearness that he founds all the subordinate objections which he proceeds to allege.

Thus, after exhibiting Christ as having assumed the throne, he says, "the first question is, whom does he associate with himself to take part in administering the government?" The answer which millenarians give is, "the saints of the Most High God." And they allege as the ground of that judgment, the assurance given by the interpreting Spirit, Dan. vii. 18–27, that at the time of the destruction of the power symbolized by the ten-horned beast, and of the investiture of Christ with the dominion of the earth, the saints of the Most High are to take the kingdom under the whole heaven

and possess it for ever; the revelation, Apocalypse xx. 4–6, that the saints are then to be raised from the dead, be constituted priests of God and of Christ, and reign with him the thousand years; and the song of the living creatures and elders—who are symbols of the redeemed in their life intermediate between death and the resurrection,—in which they offer thanks to God and the Lamb, that as kings and priests they are to reign on the earth; and that this is their answer this writer admits. It is this, accordingly, though thus clearly revealed, which he rejects as an error, and makes the object of his ridicule. For if they are right in this, the consideration on which he dwells, that they are not agreed, whether all or only a portion of the saints who shall then exist, only those who have died, or even but such of them as have suffered martyrdom and refused submission to the beast and its image, are to share in that honor, does not form any objection to the doctrine on the subject in which they are agreed, that it is the saints of the Most High, not any other order of beings, who are to reign with Christ.

He proceeds. "The next question is, Who are the subjects, or the ruled over? They are men in the flesh—men who shall live as we do in nations, live by the various pursuits of industry, who shall plant and build, shall marry and multiply." And millenarians give as the ground of their belief of this fact, the revelation, Dan. vii. 13, 14, that Christ at his coming in the clouds is to receive "dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that *all people, nations, and languages* should serve him," and a kingdom over them that is to endure for ever; and that the saints of the Most High are at the same time to receive the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven, and that all dominions are to serve and obey him; which show that the subjects of that dominion are to exist as peoples, nations, and languages, and in the natural body. The first is expressly asserted, the latter is implied both in their existence as nations, and in their subordination to the saints who are to exercise dominion over them; inasmuch as indisputably all the dead who are raised to glory at Christ's coming are to reign with him, and cannot, therefore, be subjects of the regal saints, instead of those saints themselves.

They allege as the next ground of their belief, the predic-

tion, Isaiah lxv. 17–25, that men are to exist in the natural body after the creation of the new heavens and earth, which is to be at the commencement of the millennium, and are to rear offspring, build houses, cultivate the earth, and enjoy the fruit of their labor.

"For behold I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; for behold I create Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy. And I will rejoice in Jerusalem and joy in my people; and the voice of weeping shall be no more heard in her, nor the voice of crying. There shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days; for the child shall die an hundred years old, but the sinner being an hundred years old shall be accursed. And they shall build houses and shall inhabit them, and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat; for as the days of a tree are the days of my people, and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands. They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their *offspring with them*. And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock; and dust shall be the serpent's meat. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, saith the Lord."

What language could form a more explicit prediction than this that men are at that period to live in the natural body, multiply, erect dwellings, cultivate the earth, eat its fruits, and enjoy the various labor of their hands?

And finally in confirmation of this view, millenarians refer to the Apocalypse, in which it is revealed that the nations are to walk in the light of the New Jerusalem—the symbol of the risen saints—bring their honor into it, and be healed by the leaves of its tree of life; which is equivalent to a direct prediction that they are then to exist in the natural body, and in families and organized or national communities. Millenarians have thus the most express authority in the Scriptures for their views on this subject, and it is these identical things which are thus explicitly revealed that are the objects of this critic's objections.

He proceeds: "The third question we will raise concerning

the condition of things on earth during the millennium is this: What are to be the arrangements by which those two classes of such opposite natures can dwell together, as different departments of the same terrestrial kingdom, and sustain to each other respectively the relation of rulers and subjects?" This he probably regards as the most witty and effective part of his article. In our judgment it is as weak, as unscriptural, and as unjust as that which precedes it. He, in the first place, assumes that inasmuch as millenarians hold that the glorified saints are to reign over men in the natural body, they are bound to show "what are to be the arrangements by which the two classes of such opposite natures can dwell together." They, however, are not obliged to give any such explanation. That God has foreshown that they are to exist here in the relation of kings and subjects is reason enough for their believing it. Does this writer mean to intimate what his question plainly implies, that we are not to believe anything even that God has revealed, unless we have a perfect comprehension of its nature and relations to all other things? How many of the great things, then, that are taught in the sacred volume could be subjects of our faith? Does he himself pretend fully to understand the nature of the resurrection body? Does he know precisely what the tie is to be that is to unite that body to the soul, so that the effects produced in the sensorium of the one shall create sensations and perceptions in the other, and the volitions of the soul shall move the nerves, muscles, and limbs of the body? Does he comprehend the mode in which the Holy Spirit acts on the human mind in illuminating, regenerating, and sanctifying it? Does he understand the exact mode in which the divine and the human natures are united in Christ? If not, and if he does not regard himself as bound to gain a knowledge of them before he can consistently believe what the Scriptures plainly teach on those subjects, why does he assume that millenarians should be able to state what the arrangements are to be by which the glorified saints, and men in the natural body, can both dwell in the same terrestrial kingdom? What ground indeed has he for presuming that the nature of the glorified saints is not to be such as will fit them in the most perfect manner for precisely such a sphere? How in truth, without impeaching the divine wisdom, can he suppose that

that is not to be the fact? A pitiable business truly, thus to detract from the perfections of the Almighty, in order to trump up an objection against millenarians. The affectation of critical skill and efforts at smartness which he exhibits in this part of his article are worthy of the genius he has displayed in his previous discussion, and indicate what at best looks to us very much like a "wretched superficiality." Thus he begins by asking "where is this New Jerusalem to be located?" and forgetting that it is a symbol of the risen and glorified saints, as great Babylon is of the apostate hierarchies—proceeds to declaim respecting it on the assumption, that that which it denotes is a city of walls, streets, gates, and edifices. What exquisite perspicacity! Does he regard the wild beast of seven heads and ten horns with the woman Babylon mounted on it, as representing a monster animal like itself, and hold that millenarians, in order to verify their interpretation of it, should show "where it is located," that he and his friends may go and enjoy "the gratification of their morbid and endless curiosity" the spectacle may yield? Does he contemplate the city great Babylon, as symbolizing a real commercial city situated on a great river like the Euphrates, and demand that those who hold that that which it represents, is within the limits of the western Roman empire, should point out its locality? Why not, if he puts such a construction on the symbolic New Jerusalem, and claims that millenarians should inform him where that is located?

He nevertheless affects to make out that millenarians profess to determine its location, as though that which it represents were a material city, and that they exhibit it as to be stationed over the literal Jerusalem of Palestine. Millenarians, however, entertain no such opinion; no intimation to that effect, so far as we are aware, exists in any of their volumes. It certainly is not their general belief; and the passage which the reviewer quotes from Mr. Bonar as teaching it, expresses no such notion. A very moderate share of knowledge or of candor would have withheld him from this misrepresentation.

He goes on. "Such is to be the abode of the rulers. What, on the other hand, is to be that of the subjects—human beings in the body?" And the answer he gives to this is chiefly couched in the very language of the prophets, and enumerates gifts and blessings which it is expressly foreshown in the

Scriptures are to distinguish the millennial period; such as that "the atmosphere, instead of pestilential, is to become congenial to life: the earth, in place of being blighted with sterility and overgrown with thorns, is to become fruitful. Wildernesses are to bud and blossom as the rose, and deserts smile with verdure and plenty." "All the nations of the earth are to walk in the light of the New Jerusalem. The kings of the earth are to bring their glory into it;"—and it is these specific predictions, most of which are interpreted by a large portion of his own party in precisely the same manner as they are by millenarians—that he rejects and makes the object of his small sneers and criticisms.

There are two things, however, that especially excite and puzzle him. The first is, that it should be held by us that the heavens and earth are to be the same materially as the present; their newness consisting in their renovation—when it is represented in the Apocalypse that the new earth beheld by John had no sea! A far-seeing critic truly. It wholly escaped him, it seems, that that new earth, like the New Jerusalem, was a mere symbol, and a symbol not of the earth itself, but of its population; and that as the sea of the literal earth had in the preceding visions been used as a symbol of peoples and nations in a state of commotion and revolution, the absence of the sea from the new symbolic earth, denotes that after the event symbolized by the renovation of the heavens and earth, the world is no more to be the theatre of such agitated and revolutionary multitudes.

He is equally puzzled to imagine "how it will be possible for man in the flesh to see with fleshly eyes beings who themselves are not partakers of flesh and blood." "It is not explained," he says, and "the idea of such a motley kingdom, made up of such opposite and incongruous elements, would seem," he thinks, "to bear on the very face of it an air of absurdity." But on what ground does he consider himself authorized to assume that the risen and glorified saints will not be perceptible by men in the natural body? Has he such an exact knowledge of their nature that he sees from the laws of light that they cannot be discerned by the natural eye? If so, why does he not demonstrate it? That, if in his power, is the proper way to settle the question. If he has no such knowledge, what is his

objection, but a mere appeal from the word of God to ignorance and prejudice? For his difficulty here is not with millenarians, but with God. It is to his express revelation that he objects. He is not satisfied with the fact that God has specifically foreshown that the risen saints are to reign with Christ on the earth; that all people, nations, and languages are to be their subjects; that they are to *shine* in the kingdom of God *as the sun in the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever;* which implies, we think, that they are not only to be visible, but conspicuous; and that men are to walk in their light. He is not satisfied with the fact that at Christ's transfiguration he and his glorified attendants were actually visible to the apostles, and their conversation audible. Inasmuch as he cannot comprehend how it can be, he rejects it, and denounces the idea of such a kingdom as an absurdity! Paine, Voltaire, Strauss, have taken a similar course; and the principle on which they proceeded is identically the same.

He next raises "a fourth very curious inquiry pertaining to matters in the millennium." He says:

"It is a prominent part of the millenarian doctrine, that in the times of the millennium, the gospel is to have full course and be glorified—this is the great harvest period of redemption; not only are the nations of the earth to be generally converted—(all excepting some of the more incorrigible, dwelling in certain corners of the world—corners as yet undiscovered, we suppose)—[a sneer, the reader will perceive, at Revelation xx. 8]—but the same work of conversion and ingathering is to go down through successive generations as they come into being. The question is, by what agencies and on what moral grounds is the work of conversion to be executed then? The millenarian will reply, 'The same as now—on the ground of Christ's death, and by the agencies of the truth and of the Spirit.' But we have some difficulties. In the first place, we say to the millenarian, 'You maintain that Christ is no longer executing the office of priest—he is no longer intercessor—he is king now. On what ground, therefore, can a sinner be accepted? Who is there to advocate his cause before the eternal throne, and show a valid ground for his pardon and acceptance?' "—Pp. 76, 77.

This most daring of all the misrepresentations we have had the misfortune to encounter, we have already confuted.

No millenarians entertain the revolting doctrine he here ascribes to them, that Christ's priestly office and intercessions are to cease at the commencement of the millennium. It is as directly and absolutely the converse of their faith, as it is of the teachings of the Scriptures; and nothing but such an impotence of intellect, or such a want of knowledge and culture as to constitute an extraordinary capacity of blundering, could have rendered it possible for this writer to utter such an accusation without a consciousness of its total falsehood. It is the doctrine exclusively of his own party. He drew it probably from Mr. Brown, and mistook perhaps his advocacy of it, as a fundamental element of his system for a rejection and refutation of it as an error of millenarians! What admirable discernment! How finely fitted for the task he has undertaken, when thus unable to distinguish his own false dogma from the opposite truth held by those whom he assails! What a splendid compliment to his party, thus to exhibit the error and absurdity of a single element of their theory, as enough to overwhelm millenarians with irretrievable defeat and disgrace!

He next makes a similar false accusation in respect to the Scriptures.

"We ask our millenarian brethren, in the next place, What truth do you rely upon to save sinners in the millennium? It cannot be the present Scriptures, for they will be altogether *out of date*, on your own admission; they were prepared for man in his present state and circumstances—battling with Satan, and braving the storms of temptation and of adversity—all of which will have blown over for ever before those days of peace and quietness; therefore the present Bible will not be adapted to the facts of the sinner's or of the saint's case under that dispensation of things."—P. 77.

This is, like the other, an unmitigated misrepresentation. Millenarians entertain no such belief. It is the doctrine exclusively of their opponents, and is avowed and asserted with the utmost zeal by Brown as a cardinal element of his system. Thus his second proposition is, "that Christ's second coming will exhaust the object of the Scriptures;" and he labors through several pages to support it, assuming, among other things, that "one-half of the Scriptures would be inapplicable to *saints*, and the other half to *sinners*, living

after Christ's coming—in other words, the Scriptures, *as a means of grace, will be put* OUT OF DATE *by the second advent.* It is a light shining in a dark place UNTIL the day dawn, and nothing more." Can any one doubt that the reviewer drew his representation in which he incorporates the identical expression "*out of date*," from this passage? Yet though it has been repelled by Mr. Bonar and the Duke of Manchester, was confuted by us in our review of Brown, and is rejected, we doubt not, by every millenarian who has ever heard it; this writer has the unscrupulousness and audacity to turn round and present it as a doctrine entertained by millenarians, and an inseparable element of their system. Was there ever a more unpardonable outrage? Was there ever one that seemed more obviously to be the work of deliberation? If his other false accusations might be supposed to have sprung from a mere blunder, how can this be reasonably referred to such an origin? What sort of intellect must he have, who is thus unable to tell what his own doctrines are, and imagines the most effective way of despatching his opponents is, to ascribe to them his own preposterous opinions, which they reject?

But that his mind is but a chaos of confusion, he indicates in his next sentence. If, as he holds, the Scriptures as a means of grace are to be "*altogether* OUT OF DATE" after Christ comes, it is apparent that millenarians may justly believe that new revelations will then be given. Yet although they have the authority of the word of God for it—Isaiah ii. 3—he regards them as guilty of a consummate error in entertaining that expectation. He says:—"Here they frankly confess that they are looking for a new revelation from God [we arrest the sentence to exclude a statement that is wholly false]. All the warrant they profess to give [this is a misrepresentation also] for such an expectation is, that it has been God's method in setting up a new dispensation of religion, to make a new revelation, adapted to the nature of the religion."—P. 77. He does not see that if millenarians hold the doctrine he here ascribes to them, they would be obliged to look for a new revelation in order that truths might be known that could be made the instruments of regeneration and sanctification. But his statement throughout is a sheer misrepresentation. He has

first assumed and asserted that millenarians entertain the views on this subject which are peculiar to his own party, and then sneers at them for indulging expectations which, if those views are in any measure correct, must, by his own representation, be natural and legitimate.

His "fifth inquiry pertaining to the condition of things on earth during the millennium, relates to God's ancient covenant people, the Jews; how are they to figure in these times of Christ's glory, and how are they and the Gentile world to stand related to each other?" And he first objects to millenarians that they hold that the Israelites are to be recalled from their dispersion, and re-established in their own land. This objection, like those that precede it, is directed against the Scriptures rather than against them. Of the themes of prophecy, there is no other in the whole compass of the sacred word that is so frequently treated, presented in so great a variety of forms, extended to such a multitude of particulars, and illustrated by so many comparisons, metaphors, and other figures, as the restoration of that race from their exile, reorganization as a distinct nation, and re-establishment in their ancient relation to God as his chosen people; nor are there any prophecies of which the philological sense is more obvious and certain, or more indisputably their true and sole predictive meaning. This critic himself, were he to spend years in the attempt, could not frame a proposition to express that event that would be more clear and indubitable in its grammatical signification; or that would not be wholly emptied of the sense he meant to indicate by it, by the principles of interpretation on which he denies that those prophecies foreshow the restoration of the Israelites, and refers them to the Gentiles. There is not one of the objections, indeed, he alleges against millenarians, that on his rule of construction, is not divested of all reference to them, and made to relate exclusively to some other class of persons. We have only to assume that the term millenarian, instead of being used in its natural proper sense, is employed as a mere representative of some other class; precisely as he and his party assume that Israel, Zion, Jerusalem, and other terms of the kind, are used in those prophecies as mere representatives of Gentiles, the church, and the places of their residence, and his article is swept at a stroke of all

reference to millenarians, and made to relate to some other body of men. A person of sensibility would be likely, we think, to be somewhat embarrassed by this fact. The unhesitating self-confidence, the towering vanity, the supercilious dogmatism of this writer, however, are not damped in the slightest degree by such considerations. Having reached the lofty height of antimillenarian infallibility, he deems the oracular annunciation of his opinions enough to settle the question, not only against the word of God, but against his own principles. He affects to utter it also, it should be noticed, against a large branch of his own party, as much as against millenarians; as there are large numbers, it is well known, who do not receive the doctrine of Christ's premillennial advent, who yet look with undoubting assurance for the restoration of the Israelites.

He next objects that millenarians hold also that the temple is to be rebuilt, and a ritual worship instituted; the sons of Levi are to officiate as priests, and animals be offered on the altar. This also is directed against the explicit predictions of the Scriptures—Isaiah ii. 3, lxv. 20, 21, Jeremiah xxx. 17, 18, 22—where it is foreshown that in the last days there is to be a temple of God on Mount Zion, and that after the restoration of the Israelites, God is to "take of them for priests and for Levites," who are to "offer burnt offerings and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually." The fact, however, that it is thus revealed, and that the construction which millenarians put on these predictions cannot be set aside, except on principles that are wholly groundless and arbitrary, and that divest every prophecy, promise, and doctrine of the Scriptures of its legitimate meaning, is no apology in his estimation for their believing it. He regards the reinstitution of such a priesthood and offerings as altogether absurd, and has no such faith in the infinite intelligence, wisdom, and goodness of God, as to believe that he can either make them beneficially illustrate the great work of redemption, or enable men to express through them their faith in Christ and acknowledgment of him as their expiation more significantly than in any other form.

Not content, however, with these objections to the teachings of God's word, he proceeds to misrepresent the views

millenarians entertain of them. Thus he says:—"They hold that all the Gentile nations, kings and subjects, men, women, and children, will literally come up to Jerusalem to worship, *not only annually*, but from *one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another.*" "We must say nothing about the impossibility of thousands of millions of human beings in the flesh being accommodated simultaneously within one small city; we must not speak of the inconvenience of taking such journeys so often." If he was able to prove that millenarians hold the belief he here ascribes to them, why did he not demonstrate it by quoting a passage in which they have expressed it? Can any reason be assigned for the omission, except that he had no such passage to allege, and that he was aware that it is his own unauthorized construction of the predictions—Isaiah ii. 3, lxvi. 23, and Zech. xiv. 16—which he charges on them? And can it be supposed that he was not conscious that it is a sheer caricature? No millenarians hold, or ever held, so far as we have a knowledge of their faith, that all the Gentile nations, men, women, and children, are to go up to Jerusalem not only annually, but at every new moon, and on every sabbath. The predictions that "all nations shall flow unto the house of the Lord" on Mount Zion, "that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship" before him, and that "every one" "of all the families of the earth" "that is left of all the nations of the earth which come against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year to worship the king, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles," they take in their proper sense as signifying that *persons* of all the nations will go thither to worship, and in every part of the year, as a stream flows continuously, precisely as the prediction that God "will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle," Zech. xiv. 2, denotes simply that individuals and armies of all nations, not that all the individuals of both sexes and every age of all nations, will be assembled there. That this is the construction we and other millenarians put on these passages, he unquestionably knew, and knew also that it is amply justified by the usage in the Scriptures of the terms, all flesh and all nations. How then is it that he deliberately represents us as ascrib-

ing to them a wholly different and absurd meaning? Can any other reason be imagined than a wish at all hazards to render us objects of distrust and prejudice?

He is guilty of an unpardonable misrepresentation of us also, in asserting that we "intimate" that "Christ himself" "may take part in offering bloody sacrifices." Nothing has been penned by us that ingenuity, however malicious, can plausibly distort to such a meaning. After saying that worshippers in offering victims will be able to give a visible and most emphatic expression of their thoughts and emotions in respect to the great facts and truths of their redemption, we asked, "What other rite could combine such a clear and impressive exhibition of all these great truths? What other acts could raise *the offerer* to such a vivid feeling of them, and enable him to express them with such energy? And what could raise *these acts* to such a grandeur of significance, and invest the facts and truths on which they proceed with such an effulgent reality, as *the offering of the sacrifice*, in the immediate PRESENCE of the Redeemer, and reception *from him* of visible tokens of its acceptance. To what a towering sense of his work must such a transaction, in which the Eternal Word himself takes a visible and conspicuous part, naturally raise them!" Here the part we intimate Christ may take in the "transaction," is expressly exhibited as—not the part of THE OFFERER *of the sacrifice*, as this critic represents, but the part of the present and visible Deity *to whom* the acknowledgments and commemorations expressed by the sacrifice are addressed, and by whom they are accepted;—the relation precisely in which Jehovah was present in the tabernacle in the wilderness, and in the temple at its dedication, and witnessed and accepted the offerings that were presented there. Such a Scriptural exhibition, however, of "the transaction," did not suit the purpose of the reviewer; to make it answer his end, he reverses *our* representation, and charges us with intimating that Christ himself may leave his station as the Eternal Word, the object of homage, and take the place and perform the part of an offerer,—which would imply that he has himself offended, and is a subject of the redemption the sacrifice is to commemorate!

His sixth and last inquiry respects the question whether the terms, "the bride the Lamb's wife," Rev. xxi. 9, xix. 7,

8, denote the whole of those who are to be redeemed by him, or as Mr. Bickersteth and others represent, only those whose salvation is completed at Christ's coming. None, we take it, but critics like him, would venture on the folly of raising such a question. It is "the bride the Lamb's wife," we are expressly taught, that is symbolized by the New Jerusalem, and the descent of that city from heaven shows that it is the representative exclusively of the risen and glorified saints. The righteous who continue in the natural life, are to be gathered before Christ, judged and accepted on the earth, Matt. xxv., not to descend to the earth from heaven, in order to enter his millennial kingdom. That there are to be sanctified persons on earth who are not to belong to the body denominated the bride, is seen from the representation, that "the nations *of them which are saved* are to walk in the light of that city," and "the kings of the earth are to bring their glory and honor into it;" and that "the leaves of the tree of life" that is to grow in it, are to be "for the healing of the nations." But this discrimination of the glorified saints who are to descend from heaven, from the nations of the saved who are to live in their light during their reign here, thus drawn in the clearest manner by the Spirit of inspiration, this critic cannot afford to admit. It were to overturn his whole system. He therefore fills a page with silly queries, objections, and misrepresentations, founded chiefly on the use of the word church, in a passage quoted from Mr. Bickersteth, which we are not concerned to vindicate, and winds up with a denunciation of this exhibition of the bride, as denoting the saints who are to be raised and glorified at his coming, in distinction from those of the holy who are to remain in the natural life, and those who are to be sanctified afterwards, as a "maiming of the body of Christ," and "the introducing" of a "nondescript class of the redeemed;" and with a coarseness that is nearly as characteristic of him as his untruthfulness, pronounces it "one of the most repulsive features in all the ugly compound of millenarianism."

VI. His next "point of difference" respects the resurrection. He maintains that there is to be but one. "Millenarians believe in two—that of the holy dead and those only at the commencement of the millennium, and that of the wicked dead after the millennium." His treatment of this

question is marked by his usual characteristics; first, a misstatement of the fact, and then queries and objections founded on that misrepresentation, that have their origin in "a morbid and endless curiosity." He says:—

"If we ask them what is to be the fate of those pious ones who shall die during the millennium—are they ever to be raised?—we get no answer. They have exhausted the Scriptures in making provision for the resurrection of the two classes named. This large intermediate class, larger than both the others, is dropt out; there is no provision in the whole millenarian system for bringing them to life again—unless it be in the as yet unknown new revelation they are expecting in the new dispensation."—P. 80.

He, here, in the first place, assumes that death is to reign over "the pious," in that period, as it does now. But that is against the express teachings of the Apocalypse, that they are then to be freed from that and every other curse; that "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, nor pain." That millenarians generally, and we among them, regard this and other similar passages as relating to the millennial period, this writer is aware; for he proceeds in the whole series of the objections we have noticed under the preceding head, on the fact that they regard the reign of the saints, or New Jerusalem age which this great promise respects, Rev. xxi. 2–4; 24–27: xxii. 1–8; as the same as the millennium. Now, however, he quits that ground, and that he may assail them with this objection, assumes that they hold that the New Jerusalem age is wholly distinct from that of the thousand years, and is to be distinguished from it by a different dispensation. But supposing he finds here and there a millenarian who entertains the notion he here falsely ascribes to them as a body, does the fact that they cannot give an answer that satisfies his "morbid curiosity," in regard to a point in respect to which God has made no revelation, prove that they are wrong in believing the revelations he has made on other points? Because he has not made known all that, in the condition supposed, this writer thinks he would and should, is that which he has made known to be rejected, and those who receive it denounced as absurd errorists? Does the fact that there are persons in his own party,—such as

Hengstenberg, for example, and his followers—who hold that no revelation whatever is made in the Apocalypse of the resurrection of the righteous, prove that their belief that a revelation is made in it of the resurrection of the unholy is mistaken. Why not, on the principle on which our critic proceeds in his objection?

The next subject on which he attempts to contrast the views of the two parties, is the judgment. But though he falls into several errors,—as he contents himself with simply stating what he deems the belief of millenarians, without undertaking to prove that it is erroneous,—it is not necessary that we should notice them.

VII. Nor shall we dwell on the point, with which he closes his contrast, respecting "the condition of the greater portion of the human family during the eternal ages that are to supervene after the millennium;" as the only objection he offers to the views we entertain,—which he makes the main theme of his remarks,—is founded on his ignorance "how the countless millions of human beings, with bodies and bodily wants as now, are to find sufficient accommodation on this earth at some future point in her eternal existence." But our belief that the race is for ever to continue here and multiply, is founded on explicit revelations, as in Dan. vii. 13; that the dominion with which Christ is to be invested at his second coming, is to be a dominion over all peoples, nations, and languages, and that is not to pass away, but is to continue for ever and ever; which indicates as clearly as an express assertion could, that the subjects of that dominion are for ever to continue to be peoples, nations, and languages, and therefore are to live in the natural body. The same revelation is made also in a great number of passages, in which the land of Canaan is given to the Israelites as an everlasting possession; the word of God is pledged that they shall be regathered from their dispersion, and shall dwell there for ever; that they shall build, plant, rear offspring, and enjoy the external blessings of the New Jerusalem age; and that the time shall never come when there shall not be priests of their race to offer burnt-offerings and sacrifices at the new temple on Mount Zion;—in order to the fulfilment of which, the Israelites plainly must dwell there and multiply, from generation to generation, through

the round of eternal ages. This writer's objection is directed, therefore, against the clear teachings of the word of God, rather than against us; and like many of the others he offers, is founded on the most unscriptural and presumptuous assumption that nothing is to be believed as taught in the sacred word, unless the mode in which it is to take place is expressly explained!—a principle that would subvert at a stroke every truth and fact that is made known to us in the word of God. It is precisely the principle on which they proceeded at Corinth, who asked, "How are the dead to be raised up, and with what body do they come?" and from their ignorance of the mode, denied that a revivification of the dead was to take place. But that God has not chosen to reveal to us all that "a morbid and endless curiosity" may desire to know, is no reason that we should not believe the great certainties which he has communicated to us. He, however, has not left us without the means, at least, of a judgment on the subject; as he has made known the fact that those that are alive at Christ's coming, instead of dying, or continuing for ever in the natural life, are at length to be changed from mortal to immortal, and bear the image of the heavenly. Why therefore may it not be regarded as probable that that is to be the destiny of the race then, as death is now? The necessity of some such arrangement will be no greater then than it would have been had our first parents not fallen. As some preventive of over-population would then have been provided;—so when the curse of sin is fully removed, and the race placed back in a condition essentially the same as that in which they would have existed had our great progenitors not transgressed, and a necessity arises for such a preventive, it may reasonably be presumed that it will be applied, and that it will consist, as it doubtless then would, in the transfiguration of those who are prepared for it, to a higher life.

But if the reviewer is unsatisfied with this reply, and thinks his objection an unanswerable evidence of the error of the doctrine against which it is directed, how is it that it escaped him that it is as applicable to his own theory as it is to that of millenarians? For if the principle on which his party interpret those predictions of the perpetuity of the Israelitish nation, and the endless continuance of their priesthood and

ritual worship—viz. that they are representatives of Gentile believers—is legitimate; it follows that Gentiles are to abide on the earth and perpetuate themselves in an endless series of generations, precisely as it is predicted in the prophecies that the Israelites are: and thence that their multiplication is to continue through infinite ages, after death has been abolished! The reviewer's scheme is thus as obnoxious to the objection he offers with such an air of exultation, as that of millenarians against which he alleges it.

He at length winds up his long tirade with a fresh ebullition of splenetic misrepresentation and petty insolence. He says:—

"Millenarians make very ill-natured and scolding complaints against us, that we condemn their system without examining into its foundation. They berate our ignorance and stupidity. They speak of 'deplorable degradation of the ministerial profession;' 'wretched superficiality in those who affect to be guides of public opinion;' 'not a trace of acquaintance with the laws of philology.' They will not hear a word of objection to their doctrines, except what may be made through an examination of their principles of interpretation. They may safely look out and deride and defy through the loopholes of their retreat; for few we should hope will ever think it worth while to drive them out of those unseemly places."—P. 82.

How averse he is to meet us on that ground, is seen from the fact that he has chosen rather, with a boldness of misrepresentation that is not often equalled, to deny that we hold the principles of interpretation to which he refers, of the nature of which he is undoubtedly cognisant, and asserted that we found the whole of our views on a system that is the reverse of that which we entertain. Had it been his aim to show that the expressions he quotes from us are eminently applicable to himself, and that there might justly be added to them—extreme unscrupulousness, a readiness to utter base innuendoes and false accusations, when he thinks they may subserve his sinister purposes—could he have taken a course better adapted to the end than that which he has pursued in his essay? He goes on—

"The objection they make to our mode of criticism, goes upon the assumption, that the Bible is so different a book from all other

compositions, that without the application of their peculiar laws of literal interpretation, only a small portion of it could be understood. It will be difficult to convince the pious world that this is just so. . . It is as absurd to complain of our criticisms, because we have not gone directly to work to demolish the enginery with which they forge their doctrines, viz. their peculiar system of hermeneutics—as it would be to complain of him who cries out against the cholera as an evil, before he examines into its causes, and understands the laws of its operation; or of him who condemns the Upas tree before he examines the acorn from which it grows. We answer them, that a tree may be known by its fruits, as well as its roots."—P. 83.

We ask nothing more of our readers than that they should form their judgment of this writer on the principle he here asserts, that a tree is known by its fruits. We have shown that he is guilty of an enormous, and to all appearance deliberate misrepresentation, of our views of interpretation, asserting that we deny or disregard the existence of symbols and figures in the Bible, that "the law of interpretation by which we profess always to be guided is that of giving the literal sense," and that "it is by following out rigidly" such a "system of literalism" that we "bring in the personal reign of Christ on the earth." Could a good tree possibly give birth to such a thistle, reproduce it at every conspicuous point, shoot it out at the end of every branch and stem, and display and exult in it as a proud and gorgeous livery? Would not such an outgrowth prove that the stock and root were of the same nature as the prickly leaf and sickly flower?

We have shown that he is guilty of an equally flagrant misrepresentation in asserting that we regard the present as exclusively the age of Christ's priestly office, and hold that after his second coming he is no longer to offer intercessions for men coming to God through him; a doctrine that is held exclusively by himself and his party, and that we, so far from countenancing, have rejected and shown to be in open contradiction to the Scriptures. Would a good tree be likely to put forth such a thorn, and thrust it out from every branch and bough?

We have shown that he is guilty of a like traduction in representing us as holding that Christ is not now a King, and has not now a kingdom, but is only to ascend his regal

throne and possess a kingdom, when he comes in the clouds and assumes the dominion of the earth; a doctrine he cannot but be aware is specifically rejected by us and other millenarians. We have shown likewise, that he charges us with teaching or implying that the Scriptures will, as a means of regeneration and sanctification, be wholly "*out of date*" after Christ's coming; and that if men, therefore, are renewed and sanctified after that epoch, it must be by means wholly different from those that are now employed for the purpose; a doctrine that is held exclusively by himself and his party, but that is rejected universally by millenarians, and has been specifically confuted by us. Would a couple of such thorn boughs, or twin thistles, be likely to spring from the stock of a good tree? Were such outgrowths ever known to shoot from the fig or olive, the vine or the pomegranate?

We have shown that the chief part of the objections he alleges against the views of millenarians, especially in respect to "the state of things on the earth" during the thousand years, are directed against the explicit teachings of the Scriptures. Can such pestiferous fruits be the growth of a good tree? Has the nature of things been so reversed, that light has become the head-spring of darkness, and truth the fountain of error?

We have shown that, while he proposes to "lay the two theories side by side," so that the reader may see their points of difference, and form a just judgment of their relative merits, he wholly conceals the difficulties of his own system, but makes it his aim by false statements, caricature, innuendoes, appeals to prejudice, and all the disengenuous arts of a special pleader, to run down the doctrines held by millenarians, and render them, and those who entertain them, the objects of scorn and detestation. Did such a cluster of briers; did such a harvest of brambles ever shoot from the vine, or wave as the crest of the fig-tree or olive?

And finally, we have shown that on reaching the close of his discussion, in his progress through which he at every step comes in contact with the laws of interpretation which we advocate, and had the most ample evidence before him that our great object in our discussions on the subject is to determine what the peculiarities are that distinguish the

symbolic prophecies, and what the laws are by which they are to be explained; what the nature and characteristics are of the figures, employed by the prophets, and the principles on which they are to be construed; and what the rules are by which unfigurative language is to be interpreted; and finally, to apply those laws in their respective spheres, and unfold the results to which they lead;—he yet, in the noonday light of this fact known and read of all throughout the land who take any interest in the subject, turns round and with an unblushing front denies it, and asserts that "the central law of interpretation by which" we "always profess to be guided, is that of giving the literal sense!" Did the tree of life ever shoot up into the heavens a top bearing such Upas fruits, and shedding forth into the air such deadly exhalations?

That is not the verdict, we apprehend, which fair-minded men will render. If a tree is known by its fruits; if a principle is manifested by the actions that spring from it; the course this writer has pursued cannot be regarded as the offspring of rectitude. Let the most favorable judgment be formed respecting it, that truth and candor will allow, and it must be seen and felt to be the work of a very unscrupulous mind, blinded by prejudice, and exacerbated by party passion. If his misrepresentations are thought to have had their origin in a measure in "ignorance" or dulness, it is still in a high degree discreditable; for in either case, how profound must it be, that he should not be able to see the difference between the system millenarians hold, and that which they reject; that he should not know even what his own peculiar party doctrines are, in contradistinction from theirs?

There are, we think, two or three points that are likely to be settled pretty conclusively in the minds of readers generally, by this controversy. First: That the fact that antimillenarians decline to try the question between themselves and us by the principles of interpretation which we advocate, and prefer either to say nothing on the subject, or else to resort to the grossest misrepresentation, indicates an apprehension that their system is not proof against such a test. Why else do they refuse the trial? If they should overthrow those principles, they would confute us at a stroke, and put an end to the controversy. How is it then that they

do not adopt that method? Why is it that, like Brown, they prefer to say nothing whatever of the laws of interpretation; or else, like this and several other writers, to deny that our principles of interpretation are those which we maintain, and falsely ascribe to us a wholly different system?

Secondly: All honorable antimillenarians must feel, we presume, that the interests of their party cannot be subserved by the publication of any more attacks on millenarians like that in the article under notice, and that which preceded it in the Repertory; they must feel that the coarseness, the attempts at low wit, the malignant innuendoes, and the unblushing and portentous misrepresentations by which they are characterized, are not only unworthy of one who professes the Christian name, but reflect a deep discredit on their whole body; and they will demand that if any of their number hereafter undertake to defend their views, or attack ours, they shall take care to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the subjects which they attempt to treat; that they shall state specifically and fully what the principles of interpretation are on which they proceed; that they shall ascribe no doctrines or opinions to those whom they assail but such as can be shown to be entertained by them; and that they shall conduct their discussions with fairness and courtesy.

Thirdly: Millenarians will feel that the great truths they hold are not likely to be essentially obstructed by assaults like this writer's, and others of the kind that have preceded it. No advocates ever proved more effective enemies of the cause they undertook to sustain, than those writers are of their own system. The grand result of their labors thus far is, on the one hand, a demonstration that antimillenarianism cannot be maintained on the ground on which they place it, nor the doctrine of Christ's premillennial coming overturned by the means which they employ for the purpose: and on the other, for them the equally unfortunate demonstration, that they cannot be trusted:—that anterior to examination no assurance can be felt of the justice of any of their accusations, and no confidence placed in the truth of any of their statements. This, as far as it is seen, is fatal to their aim, and sheds a disastrous twilight over their whole cause. They are thus, in fact, employed in overturning their own system.

Every blow they strike, recoils on themselves. Every victory they flatter themselves they gain, proves in the end an ignominious defeat.

Art. IV.—The Distastefulness of Christianity.

By the Rev. Edward D. Smith, D.D.

Simeon uttered words of a profound import on the occasion of Christ's circumcision, when, addressing Mary, he said, "Behold this child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel; and for a sign which shall be spoken against; that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed."—Luke ii. 34–5. The Jewish nation was divided into two parties in reference to Christ; and other nations and people have been divided in a similar manner. Some *fell* by sin against Christ into deeper impenitence—others *rose* out of sin by repentance; and the hearts of all were laid bare—whether they were hearts of love or enmity.

That some men should reject and oppose Christ, was declared in the prophecy of Isaiah in which it is said, that he should be a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence.—Isa. viii. 14. In reference to others the same prophet represents Christ as "a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation."—Isa. xxviii. 16. When, therefore, Paul, during his ministry, saw some men believe the gospel and others reject it, he said, the event corresponded with the prediction of Isaiah, "As it is written, behold I lay in Zion a stumbling stone and rock of offence; and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed."—Rom. ix. 33.

The verification of Simeon's prediction appears in the history of the church.—Acts xxviii. 24. "And some (of the Jews addressed by Paul at Rome) believed and some believed not."—1 Cor. xiii. 23, 24. "But we preach Christ crucified unto the Jews a stumbling block, and to the Greeks foolishness. But unto them which are called both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God."

The same diversity which we thus see begun under apostolic preaching, has continued to the present day. Faith and unbelief, love for the gospel and hatred of it, have gone side by side through the world for eighteen hundred years. And so far as we are able to judge from the signs now presented to our view, the past foreshadows the future, for at least a considerable period still.

That such a fact in human experience as has been mentioned should exist, need create no astonishment; and especially should afford no basis for a judgment against the gospel. The character and dispositions of men do not naturally ally themselves with reforming and purifying doctrine. The virtuous will love virtue; the pure will love purity; but, on the other hand, the depraved may be expected to disrelish them.

It is related of Melancthon, the amiable reformer, that after seeing clearly the adaptation of the gospel to a sinner's mind, he was so sanguine as to think he could, by the exhibition of divine truth, win all men to the obedience of faith. He was quickly disappointed when he tried, by preaching, the effect of the gospel on the minds of men generally. He found that gospel precious to the sinner convinced of his sin and humbled to repentance, but to others a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence. The ancient prophets did not fall into Melancthon's amiable error by cherishing a fond hope that divine truth would find ready access to all minds. Guided by a knowledge deeper than their own, they foresaw and foretold, that the Son of God himself would meet with hatred as well as love, with unbelief as well as faith.

The unbelief which existed at first and which has continued to exist to the present hour, implies that some men find Christianity *distasteful* to them. As Isaiah has said, it is to them "a rock of offence." Something in the Christian religion finds something in the heart of man with which it cannot harmonize. Man, as he contemplates Christianity, discovers that he does not love it. The *fact* of dislike is certain, explain it as you will. Not a few of those opposing Christianity have stated their objections, and in these objections it may be presumed the ground of their dislike is discoverable. The objections, without attempting to men-

tion them in detail or arrange them in classes—are various —resting in some instances in intellectual repugnance, and in others, in moral contrariety. Such as they are, they correspond with the author from whom they proceed, and they are of every degree of learning and ignorance, refinement and vulgarity. The nature of the objection made to Christianity may be fairly expected to vary with the breadth and culture of mind which men possess, and the coarseness or refinement of their moral disposition.

It is a matter of sad reflection that some men are able to entrench themselves in unbelief on grounds that are absolutely frivolous. Thus, the fact that the Bible represents God as having *repented*, has been alleged as a proof that it cannot be inspired, and cannot be true, because the Divine nature is such as to preclude repentance. Expressions giving rise to objections of this kind may be found scattered over every page of Revelation. As it is said, God repented, so it is said, he *looked* down from heaven to see if there were any that did good—that the Lord *hearkened and heard*—that the Lord's *hand* is not shortened, that it cannot redeem. But all these and similar expressions—and there are thousands of them—are sufficiently explained and justified by saying they are anthropological, or conformed to modes of thought and language common among men.

Those who can deem so futile an objection as that concerning God's repenting, decisive against the Bible, are of the lighter and baser sort. They form a distinct class, and can exert little influence. Among the opponents of the Scriptures, however, there have often been men of a far different order, and there is no wish to conceal it. Men of learning—men of science—let it then be said—have stood in array against the Scriptures. Hume, Gibbon, Lord Herbert, the French Encyclopædists, and many modern Pantheists of Germany, could claim distinction in the highest walks of intellectual life. If feeble powers do not prevent a man from disliking Christianity, neither does strong and cultivated intellect. Of the many who fall into sin and impenitence through hatred of Christ, some are gifted and dear to Fame.

But as the counterpart to this admission, in respect to the

powers and attainments of some of those who have chosen to deny revelation and oppose its influence, it may now be said that there have been men equally profound with those or any others of their class—men deeply read in literature and science—who have regarded Christianity as a true light —the word and spirit of heaven—a fountain of joy. If, then, some learned men have rejected Christianity, others equally learned have unhesitatingly received it. Newton, Milton, Usher, were Christians. If the unbelief of the one class seems to disparage the Bible, the faith of the other upholds and commends it. On the mere ground of authority, therefore, Christianity cannot be rejected. The argument of authority can be adduced with far greater strength on the other side. Some better argument than that drawn from learned men is requisite, in order that any one can feel himself warranted in disbelieving the Scriptures.

It is now proposed to look at Christianity dispassionately and candidly as a religious theory, or a connected religious system, in comparison with some other opposing systems. They who reject the scriptural system adopt another which they think preferable. Is that which they adopt, then, let us ask, better than that which they reject? Has it a clearer and deeper stamp of truth? Is it fitted to exalt man to a higher excellence? Does it wield more benign and mightier moral force?

Polytheism is an old religious system, and one with which Christianity first entered into conflict. The Greeks and Romans who rejected the Bible were the worshippers of many deities. Was their Polytheism superior to Christianity? Look at it and answer. It asserts that there are *many gods* in the universe, some superior and others inferior; that they have their separate and limited range of dominion, and their respective claims to the homage of men; but none have a universal and absolute dominion; and none are able to bestow all the blessings even that are necessary for us in this life.

Christianity, on the other hand, teaches that there is one God only—infinite in perfection, and having an uncontrollable authority in all worlds, and ability to confer all the gifts that are needful both in this life and in that which is to come, on all who will seek and accept them.

Another opposing religious system is Pantheism, which teaches that the universe is but an outbirth from God, and God himself, or a part of his infinite essence, and that man especially, is God in his highest and most perfect form.

Christianity, on the contrary, teaches that God only is self-existent and divine, and that men and all other beings and things are created by him. As created things are the work of God, they bear traces of their origin, and testify to the perfections of their author. They reveal God, but are wholly separated from him; and whether they continue to exist or perish, God is unchanged.

Another opposing system is Materialism. According to this, as the name denotes, there is no spirit—nothing immaterial. The term spirit may for the sake of convenience remain, though it can denote nothing more than a refinement of matter. Man, then, with all his powers of thought and imagination, is a form of matter, and may perish wholly by a dissolution of parts. His personality is the result of a combination of atoms, and if that combination be changed, he *exists* no longer. Christianity makes a distinction between body and spirit, and declares the spirit to be immortal and indestructible. It is distinct from body in such a sense that the dissolution of bodily parts will not destroy it.

Another system arrayed against Christianity—and the last here to be mentioned—is Deism. This, taken in its highest form, admits an eternal God, a Creator, the immortality of the soul, a moral law, virtue and vice in reference to such a law, a limited accountability with ultimate and universal happiness. This, of all human systems, is by far the purest and best. The deistical temple stands opposite the temple of God, and resembles it in form, though it is less in its dimensions. It seems like an inferior, imperfect copy of the divine temple.

Deism is a form of naturalism, and rejects the supernatural. It does not rest on inspiration—it is of mundane growth under the unaided care of men; it is a religion by man.

One chief difficulty in regard to Deism is, its want of adequate proof. The existence of God may indeed be determined by a survey of his works. The universe is not self-produced—but is the work of some great Being. That Being is God. Whether the idea of *creation* in its true sense

—the production of something out of nothing—could be satisfactorily elaborated by reason, is less manifest. Through "faith," the Scriptures say—"we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear," (Heb. xi. 3.) Even if the philosophers *could* catch the truth that the world was *created*, yet the common people did not—as the general worship of the sun in ancient times demonstrates. That philosophers—including Socrates, Plato, Aristotle,—did not fairly hold and teach the doctrine of *creation*, will not be denied. And hence the doctrine of creation is, a doctrine of revelation to be received by faith.

In regard to the immortality of the soul, Deism can give no convincing proof. If the soul's immateriality be admitted, its immortality does not *necessarily* follow. The vital question is,—what is the *purpose* of the Creator of the soul? Has God made it to live for ever? Separate from a knowledge of God's intention in creating the soul, there can be no proof that it will not perish.

Of moral law, virtue and vice, and accountability—as taught by Deism—there is a want of clearness and authority. The result is, that Deism could never be an energetic reforming religion. It makes suggestions, but fails in power to enforce them.

But such as it is, now, in the hands of Herbert and others, it is better than the religious system of the old Greek philosophers, and yet the moderns are not intellectually superior to the ancient. How then came they to construct so specious, and compared with polytheism, so good a system? It is manifest that Christianity has aided the Deist, and if it is injured by Deism, it has itself been the means of the injury,—like the eagle which fell by an arrow winged by one of its own feathers.

A word concerning Christianity itself. It professes to come from God by inspiration. As such it is supernatural—as such, it reveals the character, mind, and laws of God, and the nature, character, condition, and prospects of man. God it represents as eternal, and absolutely, infinitely perfect. He is the beginning, the source of all life—of all existence. God created all things,—"the heavens and the earth." As he created the universe, so he established a government over

it. In making man, he formed his body out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into it a living, immortal soul. When first created man was holy, but in time he fell by sin. As a sinner he was ruined. Left to himself he was for ever lost. But God pitied him in his low and wretched condition, and determined to redeem him from sin and death, and restore him to the state of glory in which he stood at his creation. To do this, God was constrained to send his own Son as a mediator, to obey and die for men—that sinners might be justified. Then to effect their sanctification, he sent the Holy Spirit to change their hearts, cleansing them from sin, and imbuing them with holiness. Thus provision is made for their full and perfect salvation.

No elaborate comparison will now be made between Christianity and the several systems of religion which have been represented as opposed to it, nor is such comparison necessary. Of Polytheism it may be said, that it has no logical ground. What did Athens want of her thirty thousand gods, when one infinite God is all-sufficient, as a First Cause —as a Moral Ruler and Judge? Pantheism divests religion of all reverence and devotion. If all things are divine, it is obvious that men cannot regard them with religious veneration. But in destroying religious reverence and devotion, Pantheism destroys religion itself. Man, on that scheme, instead of being a worshipper, is himself, in the highest sense, the object of worship; and is himself, in like manner, the lawgiver, instead of the subject of law. There is no being exclusive of himself, whom he can make an object of religious homage!

Materialism, ending in eternal night and destruction, is generally felt to be repulsive. No such system, even were there no other, should be tolerated for a moment, unless under the strongest and most irresistible necessity. Why should one *choose* to perish for ever—going out of existence by annihilation? What necessity requires it, and forces it upon him? There is none. It is sometimes, at least, chosen, there is reason to believe, in preference to other systems,—because its advocates desire it, with its darkness and destruction, rather than meet its alternative.

Deism boldly confronts Christianity with the claim of a superior excellence. It has a mocking resemblance to that

which it opposes. The Deist and the Theist have much in common—hold many identical truths. Much, however, as they resemble each other in outward form, they have in their actuating spirit no likeness. They differ from each other in reality as deeply as though they were utter and entire contradictions. Christianity has and *can* have no *fellowship* with Deism, any more than it can have with Polytheism, Pantheism, or Materialism. In truth Deism, from its uncertainty, might consort with any one of the systems just named. In spirit it much resembles them. Like them it flatters man and looks with indulgent eye upon his depravity and his sins, and allows him to hope for good though he live after the flesh and die with an unrenewed heart.

Christianity is a reforming religion, and as such undoubtedly wears a look and speaks in a tone of severity as well as authority. It has every encouragement for the man loving and seeking goodness; but it frowns upon the lover of sin, and threatens him with intolerable evil in a future world.

But there is a point of view in which it is desirable to look at Christianity and its opposing systems. Suppose them all to be *theories* of human origin, and as such, as theories growing out of the human mind, expressing not only the views but the tastes of the mind. One man, let us say, follows the bent of his mind, and chooses Pantheism or Deism, and another chooses Christianity. Shall this latter who chooses Christianity be adjudged guilty of folly, and low, mean, grovelling tastes? Is there nothing sublime in the religion preferred by him? Is there nothing beautiful—is there no æsthetic element in it? Is there no sublimity in the conception of an eternal God?—or in the conception of this God, by his inherent infinite power *creating* the world, and then sitting on his lofty throne, and in accordance with his perfections, governing all worlds and directing all events to some one grand consummation? Is there no beauty—no moral charm in the pity of such a God towards our fallen race, and in the strange loving methods adopted by him in effecting his purpose of redemption? Surely the sublime and the beautiful are found in the religion of the Bible.

But what says the Bible on *moral law?* Its utterance on

this deep and momentous subject is its chief distinction and excellence. Its moral principles are broad—its moral precepts are peremptory and fixed. The Bible does exhibit *a moral law*—a moral enactment, accompanied by a dread penalty. By this law, holiness is a necessary excellence—sin a fatal defect. Here it is most positive and unalterable, holiness *must* precede life—sin draws after it death.

But moral law is found in Deism. So it is, and what is its character and its power? It lays down rules, which require a virtue greater than men exhibit in their conduct. What then, does it condemn the offender? It has its condemning sentence, but does not urge it sternly—is lenient towards those who despise it, and never shows a countenance of fixed severity. The result is, that the law becomes mere advice, and exerts little power. Under Deism, no man would fear much to sin and continue in an evil course.

Deism, then, is lax and indulgent—Christianity is stern and inflexible. Do you say that the former is lovely, and the latter odious and repulsive? That *some men* love the former and hate the latter is not denied; but, then, what kind of men are they? They are necessarily men who find a solace in a law lenient and accommodating; who desire to be left to pursue their own way undisturbed by remonstrance or threats. Now, it is easy to conceive of beings, of *men* who would love the law of God, which is the law of perfect holiness—and love it because it is "perfect and true, wanting nothing." Suppose these men to possess a spotless virtue—to be pure in heart and action—and they assuredly will not ask nor desire indulgence, for they will find their happiness in the strictness of perfect inflexible law.

Will it now be said in reply, that men, in fact, are not purely virtuous, and therefore need a less rigorous religion than that of the Bible? We receive as true, the proposition —that men are imperfect, and add to it that they are deeply depraved, and prone to evil continually. What then, shall they have a law like themselves, and suited to their imperfections? If so, then they are imperfect for ever. Dread result! But some men *feel* their imperfections, and desire deliverance from them. These will not be satisfied with a law which tolerates what they know to be evil; they will

prefer a stricter and more perfect law, though it be a more rigorous one. They will have the boldness to look at a law demanding holiness—spotless—unstained; but such a law overwhelms them, and seals their death-warrant. True—but the Bible is not simple law, it also contains God's method of redemption. This redemption is love and kindness; but the love and kindness lead not to sin but holiness. Hence, the man slain by the law of God, can obtain life through the gospel of God. The death by the commandment leads directly to the attainment of life.

According to what has now been said, the religion of the Bible has in its moral law a mighty power, and by this it tends to repel and offend all that are unwilling to conform to it. By this law, Christianity is prying, officious, reproving, threatening, and therefore stirs up an active hatred. It is thus the law, the pure, yet stern inflexible law of Christianity, that is the ground of that enmity which some men feel towards it. It is *distasteful* to them because it reproves and condemns them. Reproof, condemnation, and threatening, are offensive, unless they induce a reformation; if they are resisted, they are hated.

But the dislike and rejection of Christianity for *such a cause*, is no reproach to it. The lovers of sin and vice, those reluctant to reform their lives, indeed, hate the Bible—but *their hatred* commends it, for it is a confirmation of its purity. If this be correct, then, if Deism had a law as pure and as rigorous as Christianity, *that* would be equally hated and rejected. On the other hand, if Christianity were a human theory or system, and its law had no sternness or power, it would induce admiration and excite eulogy. Then its beauty and sublimity would be seen and extolled—for they would be beheld without prejudice. Then the one God would give rise to philosophical hymns, and call forth a philosophical devotion.

Our conclusion then is this—that Christianity, as a divine reforming religion, will have enemies. All unwilling to be reformed, will hate and oppose it. As Jesus Christ was persecuted and slain, so any religion embodying his character, will meet with like treatment from wicked men. It is one of the signs that Christianity is from God, that *only* those feeling and lamenting their sin, and desiring freedom from

it, *do* or *can* love it. Were it loved by others, it would have to be conformed to them. But in such conformity, its purity and perfection would perish. Let us then have a religion which will not tolerate sin, which *can not* be made or *forced* to sanction it. Let us have a religion of law and holiness, and at the same time of grace and salvation, though some men, whether learned or unlearned, are without the moral taste which would induce them to approve it, and thus persuade them to embrace it. The moral disposition and tastes of men, will determine their reception or rejection of Christianity. If the inclinations be in favor of it, the result will be faith; if against it, the result will be confirmed unbelief. Obstinate habits of sin involve and insure the dislike of a holy religion. By the treatment of the Christian religion, accordingly, we can judge of the unseen heart. The thoughts of the heart are thus revealed to us, or in other words, the *moral taste* is made known.

Now any religion fitted to benefit man, must be a reforming religion, and consequently must expose sin and condemn it, abound with reproofs and warnings, and insist peremptorily on the necessity of a new heart. A religion of low requirement would tolerate sin, and fail in the power of reformation. But if a high demand be made on men, immediate occasion is given for the question concerning the possibility of fulfilling it. "How can man be just with God?" how can a sinful man keep a holy law? Provision is made in Christianity for man's weakness through sin, in the doctrine of grace and a Saviour's mediation. The keen eye of philosophy and of reason may discern in the gospel a fulness amply adequate to supply human wants. An atoning sacrifice, and a sanctifying Spirit, show how the weak can become strong, and the impure holy. Let us now suppose, in perfect agreement with undeniable experience among men, that familiarity with the gospel produces a deep sense of guilt and unworthiness, and a corresponding desire of pardon and peace. Let us further suppose that this desire becomes resident in the mind and assumes control over the thoughts and life; and we at length have a man absorbed in religious studies and pursuits, relying on the promises of the Scriptures while fully believing in the authority of their commands. The whole life thus becomes modelled in accordance

with the teachings of revealed truth. Religion is transferred from the written word to the heart, and appears in the form of a living principle. There is in this case, a decided, settled moral taste. Religion is pleasant to the soul, and is observed and cherished through love, and not under the stress of bare authority. Men are *free* in serving God. If then, there is an irreligious taste, so there is a religious taste, and if the first is *philosophical*, so is the last; for both are founded in the state of the heart, or rest on the genuine character of the mind. The former has no more reason on its side, to say the least, than the latter; on the contrary, it has less reason in its favor. If there be sin in man, the question of its pardon must be met; Christianity meets it boldly and successfully; false religions disregard it, or rely for its removal on worthless ceremonies and penances. What may be termed the religion of philosophers, opposed to Christianity, either wholly overlooks sin, or labors to diminish its demerit, and exhibits it as a venial harmless error. If they can think so, and unquestionably they *may*—then to live and die in sin is consistent with their convictions. But others, who cannot share in those convictions, cannot be expected to live contentedly in a careless sinful manner. It is as natural and proper for the religious man to love God, to pray and to promote the gospel, as it is for an infidel philosopher to slight revealed truth, and live without God and without hope.

In what has now been said in this discussion, it has been shown that religion and irreligion, as they appear in the lives of men, are appropriate and real expressions of moral taste. The state of the heart indicates itself in the one case, as in the other. Some men choose religion, and to others it is distasteful. The choice in its favor rests on its felt power to give pardon and ultimate peace and joy. The distaste is deepened and confirmed by unwillingness to repent of the sins denounced by the Scriptures. And as the reproof grows louder and the threatening more pointed, the religion from which they come, becomes more and more the object of dislike and opposition.

Art. V.—English Universities.

By the Rev. Wm. C. Fowler,
Late Professor of Rhetoric, Amherst College.

In our last number, we exhibited briefly the origin and past history, the present condition, and the proposed changes of the University of Oxford, and also certain features of the University of Cambridge. In the present article, it is our purpose to subjoin some remarks on these institutions, and also on liberal education in general, whether in England or in our own country.

The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have been called the "two eyes of England." They were long the instruments of vision for the nation at home and abroad, in the British isles, and in the four quarters of the globe. What they saw was communicated in appropriate voices to the world. They were considered as the supreme arbiters on all questions relating to science and literature, morals and religion. To them kings and statesmen resorted for a solution of their doubts. In them was concentrated a learned order, who, in succession, received, as it were by inheritance, the theoretical and the practical knowledge of the times, as well as learning proper. From each went forth into active and professional life, men of cultivated minds, scholars, divines, jurists, acquainted with political truth in its elements, who carried with them a controlling and a salutary influence into Church and State, enlightening the understanding, purifying the heart, and refining the manners of the nation. We see these worthies through the mists of ages "in long procession calm and beautiful," with their eyes raised towards the fountain of truth, with a prayer in their hearts for heavenly guidance. In the middle ages, during the rise of classical learning, during the Reformation, during the turbulent times of the first Charles and of the Protectorate of Cromwell, and, indeed, down to the present day, these institutions have been the conservators of sound learning, and of the orthodox faith. They were the light of the world; they were the salt of the earth. And thousands even now look to the one or the other as their Alma Mater,

from whose nourishing bosom they derived the "sincere milk of the word," until they grew up to the stature of intellectual manhood.

But an opinion hostile to the universities, as at present constituted, has grown up extensively in England, especially among Dissenters and Roman Catholics. It is openly asserted, that they do not accomplish the purposes for which they were founded; that being established to meet the wants of former generations, they are not adapted to the present, inasmuch as the present differs from the former; that they have grown into the decrepitude of age; that though they have been called the "eyes of England," she sees none the better for them; that though "the light of the body is the eye," yet the light that is in them is but darkness, or, at best, only sufficient to render the "darkness visible;" that instead of moving on with the age, they are stationary; that, in the language of Dugald Stewart, in his remarks concerning some of the religious and academic institutions of some parts of Europe, "immovably moored to the same station by the strength of their cables and the weight of their anchors, they enable him (the historian) to measure the rapidity of the current by which the rest of the world is borne along."

In view of the present condition of the universities, questions like the following naturally suggest themselves: Ought changes to be made? if so, what changes? and how should they be made? These questions are now before the British people, as most important questions in their bearing upon learning and religion.

I. Ought any changes to be made? That there ought to be any radical changes in the organic structure, or in the working functions of the universities, we are not disposed to admit. Such changes can neither constitutionally nor righteously be made. They would be a violation of duties owed to the founders of the colleges, to the personal incumbents in office, to those who have been educated at the universities, and to the whole nation, whose faith and honor are pledged to the maintenance of chartered rights.

It would, moreover, be bad policy to make such changes, inasmuch as it would be virtually a declaration either that the government would not keep faith with the universities,

or that the universities, having accepted a valuable trust from the founders, under the sanction of the government, will not keep faith with the dead. It would be virtually a declaration to those who are disposed, by their will or otherwise, to bestow their treasures upon institutions of learning, that these treasures may, after they are in their graves, be applied in other ways, or for other purposes than those which they should prescribe. The consequence would be that no prudent man would dare to endow institutions of learning for special purposes.

But that some changes can be constitutionally and righteously made there is no doubt. Many changes, indeed, have already been made, in which all were agreed, and these may be regarded as the pledge and the earnest of other important changes. Every literary institution is to greater or less extent empirical, and is not found, from experiment in its working processes, to be incapable of improvement. Every such institution is found, on trial, to be defective in some of its arrangements, in other words, is not perfect, and, therefore, can be improved by changes judiciously introduced.

II. The second question, namely, what changes should be made? it is not so easy to answer. They must evidently be such as will help to accomplish the purposes of the founders in the way pointed out by them. They must be such as pertain to the accidents, and not such as pertain to the essential principles of their structure and functions. In ascertaining what were their purposes, we are to interpret their language in a liberal spirit, and feel bound not more by the exact letter than by its general scope.

In our last number, we stated with great particularity the changes which have been proposed, especially in Oxford. The object aimed at by the changes proposed is to bring the university of Oxford into harmony with the spirit of the age in which we live, and enable the graduates to go forth to their several posts of duty to supply the wants of the present time. What is said of Oxford is likewise, to a great extent, said of Cambridge, though not with the same emphasis. The universities, it is asserted, established as they were in former ages, were, in their spirit and form, in harmony with the ages in which they were established. But

the spirit of those ages no longer exists, but has given place to another spirit in the British nation and the world. Hence arises the necessity of introducing such changes as shall make them the same to the present age that they were to those ages in which they were established.

Now, in this reasoning there is a fallacy as well as a truth. The fallacy is found in the assumption, that the universities were, when they were established, the exponents of the spirit of those ages; whereas, in fact, they were the exponents of a few leading minds, but not of the ages generally. They were the exponents of men like Alfred, and Baliol, and Walter de Merton, and Walter Stapleton, and others, who in succession, established the several colleges of Oxford. They were the exponents of men like Hugh Basham, and Richard Baden, and Henry of Monmouth, and others, who in succession established the several colleges of Cambridge. But they and other founders differed very widely from the great mass of the British nation in their spirit.

And moreover, the founders took measures in the very establishment of these institutions, that those who frequented them, should be sequestered from society for the very purpose of making them *differ* from the masses. They evidently intended that the universities should rear up the highest style of scholars, the highest style of Christians, the highest style of men, by excluding them from society in general, and bringing them into association with the best specimens of humanity. Indeed, in some of the colleges express rules were enacted, that no student should be permitted to enter into the house of a layman resident in the town of Oxford. It was evidently the design of the founders, that the universities should take promising young men away from the turbulence and corruption of the times, bring them into communion with everything that is pure, and noble, and manly, and afterwards send them out into the world to regenerate and reform it.

When, therefore, it is asserted by the root-and-branch men, that there ought to be radical reforms in the universities in order to bring them into harmony with the spirit of the age, we say in reply, that the assertion is based on an assumption that is not strictly true. The founders did not design

that the universities should be conformed to the spirit of the age, which largely was a bad spirit, but that the spirit of the age should be conformed to the spirit in them, which was a better spirit. We cannot believe, then, that they would wish them to be conformed to the spirit of the age now, any more than they wished them to be conformed to the spirit of the age then. But there is a sense in which the reasoning we are considering is sound. In order to accomplish all the general purposes of their creation, they must be adapted to those purposes, as means to an end. Now it must be conceded that they are not thus entirely adapted to supply the wants of the church and the state, the nation and the world. There is in them a vast amount of learning strictly so called, and of science in the proper meaning of the word, of talent and of piety, which are stagnant. There are in them noble libraries, the treasured stores of knowledge, the works of the great ones in the earth's history, of the sages, the historians, the philosophers, which are not read, much less studied, by any considerable number. There are wise men and good men, eminent scholars and eminent Christians, congregated in them, who are as a light shining in a dark place, and the darkness comprehending it not. There are collected in these institutions, something like three thousand young men, who come from some of the best families, and some of the best schools in the United Kingdom; from Eton, and Westminster, and Rugby, and Harrow. And having been nurtured in them, they then go forth, into the learned professions at home, or into the colonies, to give a character to those professions; or into rural life to refine, and dignify, and adorn it; or it may be, into the House of Lords, or the House of Commons, to control and direct the energies of the most enlightened and powerful nation on the globe. And yet there are complaints apparently well founded, that these universities do not, in their religious or their literary polity, exert their appropriate influence upon the masses of the people. We have already specified the changes which are proposed, in our last number. These changes relate, 1, to the state of discipline; 2, to the studies; 3, to the management of the revenue; 4, to the condition of particular colleges.

III. We have now come to the third question, How shall

these changes be made? The literary institutions of each civilized nation have a character of their own, and are so related to the other institutions of the country, that we cannot speak confidently as to the manner in which changes should be made in them, without being well acquainted with those other institutions. In making any of the changes proposed by the Commission, as stated in the article in our April number, regard should be had to the prescribed purposes of the founders, to the views of the visitors, of the sovereign, of Parliament, and to the rights of the several colleges, and to those of the universities at large. The wise men of Great Britain are, we doubt not, perfectly competent to take care of the whole subject, and to determine without our aid, whether any changes should be made, what those changes should be, and how they should be introduced. These questions we have brought forward, not so much for the purpose of answering them, as for that of laying them before our readers for their consideration.

We cannot reason very conclusively from American colleges to English universities. There are several points of difference between the two classes of institutions. An English university is strictly a religious institution, and belongs, in a sense, to the national church. The American colleges, which were first established, were, in like manner, consecrated to "Christ and the church." But those more recently established, have shown some tendency, like the primary schools, to lay aside their religious, or at least, their sectarian type.

An English university is national. American colleges are not national. Most belong to some particular religious denomination; some are state institutions.

English universities have foundations for the support of fellowships, which keep a body of able and promising men together under the most favorable circumstances for prosecuting their studies, and thoroughly preparing themselves for eminence, whether as authors or in professional life. American colleges have no such provision.

English universities include in them the idea of a well arranged government, of an exact code of laws, of an active police, a diligent supervision of the students. They were framed on the idea that education includes govern-

ment as well as instruction; "both the nurture and the admonition of the Lord;" subordination to authority, as well as the acquisition of knowledge. American colleges, the earlier ones, like Harvard and Yale, and Princeton and others, were established upon the same idea, and long acted upon it, borrowing their notions from England. Indeed, most or all, still to some extent act upon the same idea. But it must be confessed that many of them act upon the French or the German idea, namely, that the "young gentlemen must govern themselves." Indeed, the young gentlemen sometimes have produced the impression, that, not content with governing themselves, they aspire, in their democratic tendencies, to the control of the faculty or trustees in some of their functions, and even to the giving shape to the organic structure of the institution; as if they were the third estate, the popular, and the most important, because the most numerous branch of government.

In English universities young men are placed under their guardianship, that they may be sequestered from the world, and not be governed by its spirit, whether as seen in mercantile pursuits, in war, in politics, or in moral reform. It seems to have been the design of the founders, at least some of them, that the under graduates should not mingle much in society at large. In American colleges, the young men are not so much sequestered from general society, and conform more to its spirit, live less in the past in communion with men of former generations, and more in the future; are prophetic rather than historical in their association of thought. Many act as teachers of the primary schools. A considerable number take an interest in politics, and exercise the right of suffrage in the elections, even though they are obliged for this purpose to give up some of their college exercises and visit their homes. Some of them, in their eagerness to let their light shine before others, are in haste in their early and precocious maturity to be moral reformers, and mingle in society as religious teachers, or exhorters, before they have finished their academical education.

English universities are, to a large extent, from their great wealth, their ancient renown, from the influence of their alumni, independent in their condition, and are, therefore,

under little temptation to lower the standard of scholarship and discipline to court popular favor. American colleges, on the other hand, are comparatively poor, and have to depend chiefly on the payment of the term bills for their support, and are thus dependent on the number of students which they can attract and retain. They are, therefore, in their competition with each other for students, under temptation to underbid each other in some way, either by lowering their requisitions, or by shortening the term of study necessary for obtaining a degree, or by abolishing honorary appointments, so that there may be no distinctions which will mortify the proud and lazy, or the diligent and dull, or by granting larger liberties to the students, or by the introduction of parallel popular courses for the masses.

While English universities differ from American colleges in these and in other respects, they likewise agree with them largely in the end aimed at, in the means employed, and in the results accomplished. We propose, in the following remarks, to examine the importance and value of those results; inasmuch as they are doubted by a large class of men, both in the United States and in Great Britain.

Whoever has carefully examined the progress of human improvement in the discovery and application of truth, mus have noticed the fact, that questions which, in one age, seemed to be for ever settled, are in another agitated with as much zeal as if they had never before been investigated. In the intellectual war between the children of light and the children of darkness, the champions of learning will, on some occasion, go forth and win, with their arms of proof, wide regions of thought from the dominion of error. What they thus win with their good weapons, they regard as their own, to be transmitted to their successors in perpetual right. But their successors find that what they have thus received by inheritance they cannot enjoy in peaceful possession, but that they too, in their turn, must fight over the same battles which others have fought before them.

The questions which are thus litigated from age to age, are not those which are connected with the mathematics or the physical sciences. The discoveries in these branches of knowledge, made in ancient times, have been transmitted from generation to generation, as a patrimonial inheritance

entailed and undisputed. From the time that these have fairly been annexed to that intellectual empire, over which cultivated human mind presides, they have been considered as belonging of right to that empire. Out of the tossing ocean of theories and opinions they rose in their solid strength at the call of philosophic genius; as Delos of old in the broad Ægean, at the command of the father of gods, became fixed and immoveable.

The class of questions to which we referred are those that more directly come home to men's business and bosoms. They are practical in their nature, whether they relate to religion, to government, or to education. It is, indeed, mortifying to the pride of knowledge, that after the principles of these important subjects have been settled by a thorough examination, there should still be so many false systems of religion; so many oppressive forms of government; so many absurd plans of education. And still more mortifying is it, instead of pressing on the cause of original investigation and discovery, and the application of truths long since discovered, to hear these truths questioned, and to be obliged, therefore, to spend time and effort in proving what has been proved, and in doing over again what has been well done by others. To this mortifying condition are the friends of learning sometimes brought by those from whom we ought to hope better things, who question the value and the importance of a liberal education.

By a liberal education, we mean what is generally understood by the phrase; viz. such an education as it is the object of the more respectable universities and colleges to communicate. Originally the term meant that kind of education which is suited to a *free man*, in distinction from that which was suited to a slave. It included a knowledge of what were called the liberal arts. These arts were seven in number, viz. Lingua, Tropus, Ratio, Numerus, Tonus, Angulus, Astra, which may be translated Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, and Astronomy. As new discoveries have been made in science, and as new arts have been invented, endeavors have been made to introduce these discoveries and inventions within the scope of a liberal education, as additional subjects in the regular course of study. Ethics, Physics, and Metaphysics were soon added.

It may help us the better to understand the meaning of the phrase Liberal Arts, to bring into view, for a moment, the Mechanic arts with which they were contrasted. These were likewise formed into a Latin Hexameter verse,—

Rus, Nemus, Arma, Fabri, Vulnera, Lana, Rates,

which may be translated, Agriculture, Hunting, War, Smithcraft, Surgery, Manufacture of Cloth, Navigation. Besides these there were many others.

Having said thus much on the origin and meaning of the term, liberal education, we can easily understand why the titles, Bachelor of *Arts* and Master of *Arts*, should be given to students to indicate the degree of their advancement in the course of a liberal education.

In order adequately to understand the value and the importance of a liberal education, I would inquire what should be the end of education? If this is settled, all that we have then to do in determining the general question under consideration, is to ascertain how far a liberal education contributes to the legitimate end of education.

The chief end of education, then, is to strengthen, elevate, and refine the soul, in its intellectual and moral faculties, so that, as nearly as possible, it shall resemble God in knowledge, holiness, and happiness.

According to this view, education, as a whole, is the business of life, which we are sent into this world to perform. It is to commence with our intellectual existence, and to be continued until our eyes close in death. Indeed, this world is to be considered as but a school, in the large sense, in which instruction is communicated, discipline administered, and rewards are bestowed; and of which, God is the great teacher.

A liberal education, therefore, is only a part of the whole education which we are receiving in the school of this world; its value and its importance can be proved by showing that it contributes to the legitimate end of our whole education.

We know there are some who seem to consider education to be little more than merely training the bodily powers to employment in some branch of professional industry. The parent seems to suppose that if he has made his son acquainted with some business, in which little more is necessary than a

skilful hand and a practised eye, so that he is called a good workman, he has done for him all that is necessary. Others regard a good education as consisting merely in the cultivation and furniture of the intellect. They make great efforts in their studies, mainly that they may be the better prepared to engage with success in the practice of some of the higher professions. Others still regard a good education as consisting mainly in the cultivation of a graceful expression of the social feelings in the civilities of life; or, in other words, of those polished manners which qualify him who has them to have intercourse with the world as a gentleman.

We apprehend that great practical evils have arisen from such narrow and erroneous views in regard to the chief end of a good education. To this circumstance it is owing that so many have regarded their education, whatever it may be, as valuable only as a means of personal advancement. They regard their education as another would an investment in trade, as the means of making money, or of gaining influence, or of being useful in a particular way. Now an education gained for such a purpose, and adapted to such a purpose, may, in the issue, prove instrumental in accomplishing such an end. It may enable a man to become rich, or influential; it may be useful in a certain sphere. But it does not make good, or wise, or great men. It may make men distinguished in certain professions, but it will cause them to view everything in its relation to these professions, and not in its relations to man or the universe. It will cause them to be blind worshippers of the idols of the Den, and not the enlightened worshippers of the great Divinities.

For the attainment of a liberal education, it is expected that a young man, after going through a certain preparatory course, shall spend four years at college in disciplining his mind by study, and furnishing it with knowledge. During this period it is intended that he shall, in a good degree, be withdrawn from all professional pursuits; that he shall, if need be, leave his father's roof, associate mainly with those who are engaged like himself in the acquisition of knowledge, and in the improvement of their minds. He joins them, at first, as a timid stranger. He is among them, but not of them. By degrees he becomes interested in his companions, in his teachers, in his pursuits. He catches the spirit of

the place. If he makes a good use of his opportunities, he finds that, in the course of the four years during the forming period of his character, he has undergone a great change in his tastes, in his associations, in the frame-work of his mind, and in its furniture. And he is never more sensible of this than when he pays a visit to the village or the hamlet where he spent his early years. As he converses with his youthful comrades, who have been stationary while he has been making progress, he perceives, with some little feeling of vanity it may be, on his part, and of envy on theirs, that he has left them far behind in the improvement of his mind. Remember that we are speaking of him who, fired with a generous love of learning, has dedicated days and nights to mental discipline and acquisition: and not of him, who, having assumed her livery, is ever ready to escape from her service as from a drudgery.

In order to understand how it happens that this improvement is made in pursuing a course of liberal education, we would notice, with some particularity, the studies to which he attends during his connexion with the college.

The Latin and Greek languages constitute a large and distinctive part of the course in a liberal education. In defence of these we would remark, that, men the best qualified to judge have agreed in exalting them to the high standing which they now occupy in collegiate studies. Their opinion of them has resulted from observation and experience. One of them has said that classical literature was the "ark in which all the civilization of the world was preserved during the deluge of barbarism." The revival of learning, after the night of the dark ages had begun to pass off, was chiefly but the increased cultivation of classical literature. Hence it has happened that, in every civilized nation of Europe, its literature is formed upon classical learning as a basis. As we are best acquainted with English literature we can easily understand that the remark is true so far as it is concerned. Classical literature enters into its very structure, and makes a constituent part of it. Classical learning has furnished it largely with words, phrases, allusions, illustrations, sentiments, opinions, reasonings. If from any piece of elegant English composition we should, by any analysis, be able to take away whatever of form and spirit was derived from classical learning, we should, by so doing, take away

all its beauty. We should leave only the *caput mortuum.* No one could write a history of English literature, springing as it does from classic fountains, without a knowledge of those languages. No one can adequately understand such a history without the same knowledge. No one can appreciate the higher branches of English literatrue, unless he has been trained in the school of classic literature.

Hence, it has happened that the literati of all civilized nations of both continents agree in their attachment to classical literature, and insist upon an acquaintance with it as a prerequisite qualification in a candidate for admission into the republic of letters. And, if any should endeavor to get himself enrolled as a free citizen in that republic without this qualification, he would find, as he mingled with the real literati, the *free born* citizens, that he was still, in fact, a stranger and an alien. Thus they would view him; and thus would he view himself.

Besides the fact that classical literature is interwoven in the modern literature of our country, and in that of other civilized countries, it should be remembered that it can be defended on the ground of its own separate and independent merits. The Greek and Latin languages, in prose composition and in poetry, present a standard of taste to which the student can refer his own productions, and those of others, in estimating their excellence. By a standard of taste, we mean what the human mind, when thoroughly instructed and improved, approves. Let the student become familiar with these models of composition, let him learn to admire their structure, their order of thought, their graceful forms of expression, the beauty of their allusions, and the distinctness of their illustrations, and he will, as a matter of course, find his taste elevated and refined. If it is asked, why not go immediately to nature for the improvement of taste, rather than to these? We will give several reasons, if need be, whenever it shall cease to be the approved practice for modern genius to resort for the cultivation of taste to the models of Grecian architecture and Grecian sculpture, and not merely to nature.

Besides the improvement of the taste, every faculty of the mind is invigorated by the study of the Latin and Greek languages. The memory is constantly exercised in learning

the rules, and in retaining the meaning of words. The reason is employed and strengthened by applying the rules, by discriminating between the meaning of a word in one place and its meaning in another. Indeed, it is impossible to arrive at the meaning of a single passage, without having reasons pass through the mind. It is impossible to satisfy a competent teacher when reciting to him, without alleging reasons for the construction that is given to a passage. It is impossible to arrive at the general signification of any important word, without going through a course of inductive reasoning; that is, the word must be seen in a number of different connexions of thought, and a general signification adopted, that will include the variety of cases.

We need hardly say, that the habitual contemplation of the many grand and beautiful objects which are addressed to the imagination in the classics, can hardly fail to impart to it activity and vigor.

Such is the advantage of the study of the languages, that it was justly said by the emperor Charles the Fifth, "to learn a new language is to acquire a new soul."

Moreover, it should be remembered that the Latin and Greek are the most perfect languages—unless the Sanscrit is an exception—ever employed by the human voice for the communication of thought. Lord Brougham says of the Greek language, "It traces with ease distinctions, so subtle as to be lost in every other language. It draws lines where all the other instruments of the reason make blots. Nor is it less distinguished by the facilities which it affords to the poet."

Moreover, in the act of translating from the languages, there is a constant effort at composition, so that the pupil thus acquires a more accurate knowledge of his own language than he could in any other way, and learns to express himself in it with perspicuity, precision, and force. President Dwight once remarked, that he never knew but one man who could write the English language correctly, without having studied the classics.

Besides, in order to understand thoroughly the history of a nation, it is necessary to become acquainted with its language. There is such an affinity between language and character, that if one would understand the language of a

nation, in its origin and derivation, he must understand the history of that nation. A history of human language is a history of human nature, in the development of thought, feeling, motive, and action. Language is the index of character, and it is recognised as such, not only by men in their intercourse with each other, but likewise by the omniscient judge of all. Even the vocabulary of a nation, independently of its combinations, shows something of the national character; as, for instance, the great number of weapons of attack and defence found in the columns of a Latin dictionary, proves that the Romans were a warlike people.

Finally, the classics are of service to the student in the lofty sentiments of patriotism which they contain. "The public obligations stood in the foreground of all the ancient morality. The idea of the commonwealth as the supreme object of his duty and his solicitude, attracted to itself the strongest emotions in the breast of every virtuous man." This cannot but have a favorable effect in counteracting that supreme selfishness which is the fashion of the present times.

We know it is said that translations will answer every important purpose. This can be said only by him who knows not the difference between the original and the translation. A translation—to borrow an illustration from Don Quixote—is to the original what the wrong side is to the figured side of the tapestry.

An objection is sometimes made, that the influence of the classics, in their exhibition of vice, is corrupting. In reply, we would say, that the evil, whatever it is, is open and undisguised, and, therefore, is not as injurious as many of the novels, much of the poetry, and many of the newspapers of the present day.

It is said that, in the study of the classics, too much time is wasted upon words. In reply, we would say in the language of the French minister, "words are things."

These are a few considerations which go to show the importance of the classics in a course of liberal education. Opposition has been made to them at different periods, only in the issue to show their excellence, and to increase the study of them.

The mathematics make a part of the course in a liberal

education. Opposition has been made to them, though not with the same violence as to the classics, for the reason that the various applications of this science to the practical arts of life manifest its importance even to those who see no value in it for the discipline of the mind. Still, however, the question is asked, Why should a student be compelled to devote years to the acquisition of a species of knowledge which is useful only as it enables him to become acquainted with astronomy, navigation, and other sciences, into which mathematics enter, when he expects neither to calculate eclipses, nor to take an observation, nor to make any practical use of those sciences? What has stereographic projection to do with law, or geometry with physic, or conic sections with divinity? Questions like these betray great ignorance of a superior education, and likewise of the relation of one branch of knowledge to other branches. The truth is, "everything throws light upon everything." It is a remark of Fontenelle, quoted with approbation by Dr. Thomas Brown, that a work of morals, of politics, of criticism, and even of eloquence, will, if other circumstances have been the same, be the more beautiful for coming from the hand of a geometrician. Such is the connexion of every science with every other, that the more thoroughly a man is acquainted with any one of them, the better is he qualified, *cæteris paribus*, to think, to write, and to speak on any of the others.

But the grand argument for the study of the mathematics is found in the discipline it affords to the mind. "By the consent of all who have had a good opportunity for judging, it is especially adapted to sharpen the intellect, strengthen the faculty of reason, and thus prepare the mind for the successful investigation of truth." Lord Bacon mentions a writer who, "reflecting that mathematicians being the only set of men who either maintained no controversies, or, at least, soon come to a determination of them, hence apprehended that mathematicians alone were possessed of the right method of inquiry." Accordingly, he endeavored to apply the mathematical method to other subjects. Whether it can be thus advantageously applied, we are not now inquiring. At least it is true, that minds that have been trained in the study of the mathematics are better prepared

than others for the investigation of other subjects. It was upon this ground that Plato said, in reference to entering his school, "Let no one enter here who is unacquainted with geometry." Indeed, it is said, that Plato declared that he would have his disciples apply themselves to the study of arithmetic, "that they may learn to withdraw their minds from the ever shifting spectacle of the visible and tangible world, and fix them on the immutable essence of things."

The physical sciences occupy a portion of attention during the college course. Less opposition has been made to these, and, therefore, less is demanded in the way of defence. We need not say how desirable it is that the sympathies of the soul should be touched into harmony with external nature. The subjects connected with these sciences are valuable, as tending to produce a habit of observing the various phenomena and the general laws of nature. In connexion with natural theology, the study of nature tends to repress a spirit of arrogance, and produce simplicity of character.

The practical application of these sciences to the arts of life, in the increase of the products of agriculture, mechanical and commercial industry, is attended with so many obvious advantages, that even the opposers of colleges make very little opposition to them. We speak of them now only as what should be known by every man who pretends to a superior education. The composition of matter disclosed by chemistry, the laws of motion disclosed by mechanical philosophy, the various forms of vegetable, animal, and mineral existence, as disclosed by natural history; the present state and the past history of the globe we inhabit, as disclosed by geology; the condition and laws of the planetary and stellary systems, so far as they are understood, are appropriate subjects of inquiry for every rational mind; and no man unacquainted with them can be considered as liberally educated.

The study of ourselves, considered as individual and social beings, makes a part of the course of a liberal education. The study of the laws of the human mind, of human obligations and relative duties, of our individual character, and of the structure of society, deserves the attention of every man who aims at a superior education, as the bare mention of them must show. Γνῶθι σεαυτὸν *e cœlo*

descendit. Who would willingly remain ignorant of what the great masters of reason have written on the character of the understanding, on our speculative and our active powers, on the laws of association, on the will, on conscience, on the affections and passions? Who would willingly remain ignorant of what the great teachers of morals have written concerning man as a member of society, and the obligations which he owes to the family, to the community, and to the nation with which he is connected? Who would be willing to have all such books as Locke, and Stewart, and Paley, struck from the list of studies?

In our estimate of a collegiate course of study, we are to bear in mind that it is the object of that course to lay the foundation, not to raise the superstructure; to give a *liberal*, not a *professional* education. Undoubtedly many studies might, with advantage, be added to the list; still we should consider, that though many more should be added, there would many remain behind. All cannot be included. "Life is short, and art is long." There must, then, be a selection. and the only question is, what studies should be prescribed? In reply, we would say, that such studies should be prescribed, and such modes of instruction adopted, as are best adapted to fix the attention, to direct the train of associations, to guide the judgment in the investigation of evidence, to awaken and control the imagination, to arrange the stores of memory, and to animate the powers of genius. And if the studies are properly used which are prescribed in most of the colleges, these results will be produced.

The students, as they meet together two or three times a day, to recite and to hear recitations; to hear lectures and to see experiments, as well as to attend upon text-book instruction; as they pursue their studies at one time alone, at another with their room-mates; as they are forced to give reasons in the recitation-room as well as to make statements; as they have intercourse with those who are in the same circumstances with them, who meet with the same difficulties, or who have passed through them; as they discuss subjects in classes, or before the societies—do, as a matter of fact, learn to study, learn to think, learn to speak. We never knew of an individual who made a good use of his advantages during a four years' residence at any respect-

able college, who was not ready to say that he had derived great benefit in the improvement of his mind. We could summon, if need be, a cloud of witnesses, both of the living and the dead, to bear testimony in favor of a collegiate education. "They would tell us of those powerful correctives of singularity and frowardness which are found in the attrition of mind against mind, on a spot where different classes live together under a system of general discipline; of the force of established rules in producing early habits of regularity and decorum; of the strong though easy yoke that is thrown over the impetuosity of youth; of the propensity of the heart, unassailed by care, to form the best friendships and from the best motives; of the efficacy of oral instruction diligently communicated; of the competitions that will arise among numbers whose judgments on their respective qualifications are too frequent to be eluded and too impartial to be resisted."

Thus Dr. Parr, speaking of Bishop Lowth, says: "He had been educated in the university of Oxford; he had spent years there in a well regulated course of discipline and study; and in the agreeable and improving commerce of gentlemen and scholars; in a society where emulation without envy, ambition without jealousy, contention without animosity, incited industry and awakened genius; where a liberal pursuit of knowledge and a genuine freedom of thought was raised, encouraged, and pushed forward by example and by commendation." These are the natural feelings of a son towards his alma mater. "A liberal mind will," says Gibbon, "delight to cherish and celebrate the memory of its parents; and the Teachers of Science are the parents of the mind."

A similar feeling we entertain, almost as a matter of course, towards certain favorite authors with whom we became acquainted during our connexion with college. And here we cannot do better than to quote a passage which we lately met with in an article on a different general subject. "Nothing can be more natural than that a person of sensibility and imagination should entertain a respectful and affectionate feeling towards those great men with whose minds he had, in their works, daily communion. The debt which he owes to them is incalculable. They have guided him to truth. They have filled his mind with noble and graceful images. They

have stood by him in all vicissitudes. They have been his comforters in sorrow, nurses in sickness, companions in solitude. Time glides by. Fortune is inconstant. Tempers are soured. Bonds which seemed indissoluble, are daily sundered by interest, by emulation, by caprice. But no such causes can affect the silent intercourse which we hold with the highest of human intellects. These are the old friends who are never seen with new faces, who are the same in wealth or in poverty, in glory or in obscurity." *

Having spoken of the importance and value of a liberal education, chiefly in regard to its influence upon the individual, in elevating his intellectual, and ripening his moral nature; we proceed to inquire concerning its value and importance in qualifying him to be useful to his fellow-men, in the relations of society.

In order to do justice to this subject, we would remark that the opposers of learning have said that a philosopher is one who studies everything and does nothing; that he is an intellectual miser, who hoards up his stores of knowledge, without any disposition to impart them to others. They have said that the tastes and habits of a literary man disqualify him for acting his part in the drama of crowded life, with pleasure to himself or with advantage to others. There is a fascination, say they, in literary pursuits, which is apt to make men forget the duties they owe to society. While reposing in the soft shades of retirement, and inhaling the fragrance of the balm diffused around them, they are in danger of giving themselves up to a sort of luxurious indifference, and to think very little of the part God calls them to act in the busy scenes of life. Or, if they are not so much absorbed in the pleasures of these pursuits as to forget that man, as an active being, has important duties to perform, they are still prone to look upon these duties as somewhat irksome and unworthy of their elevated and refined regard. They attach a sort of vulgarity and repulsiveness to the every day business of a man who is going through the drudgery of active life. When the mere man of letters sees the statesman, for instance, toiling amid the dry documents

* Review of Bacon, Edin. 1832.

of finance, and projecting schemes for the promotion of mere national wealth, how apt is he to be disgusted with the employment, as destitute of everything that can charm the taste, or quench the thirst for knowledge. Here are no shady groves, nor winding rivulets, no Castalian fountains nor Arcadian landscapes; the rugged paths of business are not the creation of fancy. They call for the sober toils of intellect, working its way through a long process of thought and calculation, and putting to flight the images and delights of classical associations.

In some such language as this, the opposers of learning and of literary men, have expressed their opposition. Or they will select such an instance as Gray, the poet, who spent his life in the enjoyment of the luxuries of literature, in seclusion from the busy world, as a fair illustration of the injurious effects of learning.

Now we are ready to grant that some who have distinguished themselves in the walks of learning, have proved that they were entirely unqualified for the duties of active life. It may be true of the proud, shy poet, just mentioned, that he was no better qualified for the duties of active life, than he was to excel in horsemanship, having never, it is said, in his life, mounted a horse. It may be true that Bacon, the great philosopher, never ought to have been Lord Chancellor, and that Addison ought not to have been Secretary of State. It may be true that Gibbon never distinguished himself in the House of Commons, nor Byron in the House of Lords. It may be true that some have plodded in their closets until, like the "great owl, or the little owl," they cannot bear the strong light of public life. But for these few, we can point to thousands who have drunk copiously from the fountain of learning, and, like a "giant refreshed by wine," have felt themselves invigorated by the draught.

It hardly needs to be mentioned, that the great points to be gained in the course of a liberal education, are the *discipline* and *furniture* of the mind; expanding its powers, and storing it with knowledge. And the question at the present moment is, whether a person who has disciplined his mind by exercise, and furnished it with knowledge, is better prepared to bless mankind by his efforts than one who has not? This question resolves itself in the very statement of

it. According to the views already presented, a liberal education, as obtained at college, is only the foundation of a superior education, the superstructure of which is to be raised and finished by the individual himself, in subsequent life.

Then a liberal education is important as a preparation for professional education, and is in this way valuable as a means of usefulness. We do not mean that this is true in regard to every profession. Some professions in the minute subdivisions of labor, instead of demanding much mental discipline, require little besides bodily strength and activity. Some professions, however, on the other hand, require, in order to excel in them, all the discipline and all the knowledge that a liberal education can furnish.

This is true eminently of what are called the learned professions. This is true of the profession of law; which requires, in order to understand its distinctions and to comprehend its principles, an intellect sharpened by exercise, and enlarged by study. It requires a mind trained to the analysis of thought; trained to the interpretation of language; trained to a correct and graceful expression of opinions and sentiments.

Moreover, if great thoroughness of legal education is desired, a knowledge of the Latin language is indispensable; inasmuch as a thorough legal education is unattainable without the study of Civil Law, which is the term used for Roman Law.* No one can successfully study Roman Law, without an acquaintance with the Latin language. Roman Law, it is acknowledged, affords the example of a completer and more self-connected system than the jurisprudence of any modern nation can exhibit. Evidently a minute and comprehensive knowledge of that system, in its principles and their application, cannot be acquired without a philological knowledge of the language in which this law is written; and an historical knowledge of the circumstances under which it was developed.

Besides, many of the law maxims, and moreover, the decisions of the English courts, which are Common Law, were

* Many of the terms used are expressed in the Latin Language.

made by men whose minds were intimately conversant with classical literature, and trained to habits of mathematical demonstration, logical precision, and rhetorical illustration; the most of them were made by men educated at the universities. To enter fully into their labors, it is necessary that the mind of the student should be trained as theirs were. So beneficial are the mathematics which contribute to this training, that many have been ready to say, that they learned how to state an argument extemporaneously from being obliged to give demonstrations of mathematical propositions, while in college. Indeed, one of the most distinguished and successful advocates in our land was accustomed immediately before going into court to make some great plea, to demonstrate a difficult proposition in Euclid as a mental preparation.

It should be remarked, in this connexion, that such is the advantage of a liberal, in the way of preparation for a professional, education, that in some of the states and in some of the courts a longer period of study by two years was required for admittance to the bar, for those who have not, than for those who have been graduated at a college.

What is true of the profession of law, is, to a large extent, true of that of medicine. "Among the most illustrious scholars, since the revival of letters, no inconsiderable number of them have been physicians." Formerly, indeed, all medical works were written in Latin. Though this is no longer the case, still traces of this language are frequent in all valuable medical works. But the intellectual training in colleges will be of great service to the physician in learning him to reason upon correct principles, concerning the nature of various diseases and the modes of their cure. Moreover, in the natural sciences, he becomes acquainted with facts and principles that are of great value in their immediate application in the practice of his profession. Thus, in the discipline of mind and in the knowledge furnished by a liberal education, will he, when called to exercise the divine art of healing, have resources, which will supersede the necessity which some feel themselves to be under of resorting to the arts of quackery and imposture. We have never heard of a physician, liberally educated, who adopted the Thomsonian practice, though it is possible that there are

those thus educated who have done so; inasmuch as there are quacks in all the professions.

The profession of theology peculiarly demands the preparation furnished by a liberal education.

What is Protestant theology but certain doctrines and precepts drawn from the Bible, by the application of philology and criticism? And how can this philology and criticism be applied without a profound knowledge of the language and history of the ancient world? Learning is necessary in order to discover the evidences of Christianity; to examine the miracles that were performed; the prophecies that have been fulfilled; the correspondence between sacred and profane history; the harmony of the doctrines revealed with each other and with nature. Revelation being conveyed to us in written language, cannot be understood in its import without a knowledge of the laws of interpretation. To understand the laws of interpretation, as applied to the Bible, an intimate acquaintance with language generally, viz. in those points in which all languages agree, is necessary. Besides this, there are interpolations, and omissions, and various readings in the text; there are conjectural emendations; and profound learning is necessary to judge of these. Moreover, a man's mind, who enters the ministry, must be disciplined by study to take in a wide view of divine truth, so that he shall be consistent with himself in his statements.

And, besides all this, it should be remembered that, in the Greek church and in the Roman Catholic church, men of learning have taken care of the sacred codes; have defended them; have examined them; have enforced their truths on the consciences of men; have transmitted them to us; and no one can adequately understand the history of the doctrines of the church, or church history in general, or the lives and characters of good men of past ages, or enter into their labors, without having disciplined his mind and stored it with knowledge.

And in addition to this, it should be remembered that "in Germany the Reformation proceeded from, and was carried through by, the *Academical Divines;* the princes, the cities, and the people only obeyed the impulse first given and subsequently continued from the universities. In its origin, the religious revolution was, in the empire, a learned

revolution, and every permanent modification and every important movement had some learned theologian for its author. From this circumstance, the determination of religious opinions then was naturally viewed as a privilege of erudition—as more the function of the universities than of the church, the people, or the state."

In order to understand the history of the Reformation and the doctrines of the great Reformers, in order to appreciate the value of their labors and the excellence of their character, in order to accord to such men as Luther and Melancthon the admiration which is their due, it is necessary to enter into their spirit, to drink at the same classic fountains at which they drank.

The great lights of the English church were men who had enjoyed the advantages of an education at either Oxford or Cambridge. The divines who gave a character to the religion of New England, were men liberally educated.

It was originally intended that the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and that the people should seek the law at his mouth. The great and important subjects that he was required to investigate, pertaining as they do to the character of God and his moral government, and the duties and destinies of men, require the best human talents, improved by the highest cultivation. Besides this, he is required, in his official duty, to come in contact with his people at many points; and, therefore, at all points should he be armed with the truth, that he may give to every one a portion in due season.

It has long been a favorite opinion of ours, that ministers should take an active part in the great cause of popular education; and in order to do it successfully, they must themselves be thoroughly educated.

As we attach importance to this opinion, we shall dwell on the arguments in support of it with some particularity.

Our first argument is derived from the *nature of Christianity.* It is a religion which addresses accountable beings through the medium of their intellect; and just in proportion as you improve their intellect, will you enlarge their capacity of being influenced in their moral nature by the power of divine truth. Now, as we know that Christianity is a general provision for the spiritual wants of all mankind

we may be sure that all classes of the community ought to experience so much of intellectual cultivation as shall qualify them to receive the benefit of that provision.

Other religious systems were designed, at least in some of their parts, for only certain privileged orders in the community; while the many, the οἱ πολλοὶ, as they were styled by the Greeks, were excluded from a participation. Those systems had their exoteric doctrines, which were communicated to the common people; and their esoteric doctrines, which were communicated only to the few, to the initiated, as they were styled.

But among Christians it is not so. To the poor the gospel is preached; to them it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom. Now, in order that this preaching be effectual in any high degree, in order that these mysteries be understood adequately, mental cultivation is necessary. Evidently it is the duty of the minister to endeavor to promote the intellectual improvement of those who may come within the sphere of his influence; for, in accomplishing this, he is preparing them to understand and appreciate the truths and duties of religion.

Our second argument is derived from the *character* of *Protestantism*. The right of private judgment, in opposition to all human claims to a dictatorial authority in matters of faith, is an essential article in Protestantism. Now, this single fact that we call no man master, is proof that the followers of Christ are regarded as being capable of forming an opinion for themselves; and, in order to form a correct opinion, some degree of mental cultivation is necessary.

The Roman church, on the other hand, acted on the principle that ignorance is the mother of devotion; as well she might, since an implicit faith in her decisions was enforced on all her adherents. Indeed, in certain periods of that hierarchy, when men seemed to consider religion and philosophy as mortal enemies of each other, that what is philosophically true may be theologically false, *carbonaria fides*, or implicit faith, was, in fact, the faith of a large part of that church.

But the Reformers, in opposition to this, took the ground that the Bible is the religion of Protestants; and, in doing this, they virtually declared themselves in favor of elevating the condition of the great mass of the people up to such a

level that, in the exercise of the right of private judgment, in the formation of their religious opinions from the Bible, they would not wrest it to their own destruction. It is true, that what is now understood by the term popular education, was not then thought of as practicable. But they adopted such principles, and pursued such a course in diffusing intelligence among the people, as justifies us, so far as their authority is concerned, in promoting the cause of popular education. Romanists might commit the error of opposing revelation to reason, and in so doing, might extinguish the light of both; but Protestants, if they are true to their principles, must bestow the greatest possible cultivation on reason, in order that the truths of revelation may be the more distinctly seen and the more deeply felt.

Our third argument is derived from the practice and principles of our *Puritan forefathers.* Besides the general principles of Protestantism, they adopted extensively the opinion that the people were capable of self-government in political and religious affairs, and this implies that they should be educated. In accordance with this, they adopted measures for the establishment of common schools and a college. In eleven years after the settlement of Massachusetts the foundation of Harvard college was laid; and in seventeen, the system of free schools was organized. The clergy of those times were active not only in procuring the establishment of these institutions, but likewise in sustaining them. As teachers, as patrons, and visitors of the schools and the college, they exerted a controlling and salutary influence.

Our fourth argument is drawn from the example of some excellent ministers in our own recollection. They avowed and acted on the principle that they were under the same obligation to lend their aid in fitting young men for college that they were to preach the gospel. Many of them taught school during the winter for the young people of their congregations. The consequence was, that these thus became acquainted with their minister, esteemed him, respected him, and in subsequent years sustained him. This was the course of some of the best ministers of the land.

If, then, it is the duty of ministers to promote the cause of popular education, and generally to elevate the public taste and to refine the public sentiment, they ought to qualify

themselves to do it by educating themselves as thoroughly as possible.

For professional education and for success in all the higher professions, a liberal education is a most valuable preparation. Unless a man learns to look abroad upon the wide fields of literature and science, before he engages in professional life, he probably never will do it. And even though he should become somewhat eminent in his profession, still this will only show his ignorance on other subjects the more.

Now and then there are splendid exceptions to this general remark. Such a man as Franklin, or Patrick Henry, or Nathan Smith, can be cited to show that a man may, by the force of his native genius, by industry, and by the power of concurring circumstances, raise himself to a high standing in influence and respectability among his fellow-men without the aid of a collegiate education.

But it should be remembered that these men would never have been what they were, if there had been no colleges in the country. "When an elevated standard of education is maintained by the higher literary institutions, men of superior powers who have not had access to them, are stimulated to aim at a similar elevation by their own efforts, and by the aid of the light that is shining around them. They catch the thought, the spirit, and the language of those with whom they are conversant, and thus, perhaps, through them, receive some of the advantages of a collegiate education."

Besides, the general fact has been that these very men who have thus risen, have been deeply sensible of the disadvantages under which they labored from the comparative deficiency of their early training, and have been the advocates of a liberal education. Henry Clay, in some of his passages at arms with John Randolph, when taunted by him on his incorrect use of a certain word, referred with tears to the difficulties he had experienced from the want of a liberal education such as the other had enjoyed. General Washington left a legacy for the establishment of a national university.

But it is alleged that all that we have said is the mere offspring of prejudice in favor of a system that is old and which ought to be given up for something new.

On this point we cannot do better than to quote a passage

which had a somewhat different application:—"One of the most foolish whims of this age is to deride the old. Those who are absurd enough to do so, forget, or perhaps never knew, that there lies deep in the human heart an inextinguishable reverence for the past. As time goes on, all the meannesses that encompass human life disappear, and the grand features in the characters of the ages alone remain as objects of our contemplation. The venerable forms of antiquity stand before us in severe relief, and we bow down in a willing homage of the heart to their unutterable majesty. The past is sacred. It is set beyond the revolutions of nature and the shifting institutions of man. He who would destroy this treasury of the human heart and mind, by rudely assailing our reverence for the old, would rob human life of half its charm and nearly all its refinement. Let no enthusiastic student, then, permit his ardor to be chilled by the fear that his love has been wasted on an unreal thing; that he has been bewildered by an idle dream; and that he has lost much precious time which ought to have been given to the stirring interests of the present; for he may rest assured that the study of antiquity has a noble power to elevate his mind above the low passions of the present, by fixing its contemplations on the great and immortal spirits of the past."

Go on, then, we would say to every student in college, go on with good courage and not be troubled because, while in college, you are required to study some ancient authors, contemplate some ancient truths, and because collegiate systems of instruction are ancient. Let your minds be well disciplined and well furnished, and you need not fear but that you will have abundant opportunities for usefulness and success. Never was there a fairer field for enterprise than that which lies before you. And, as you look out from the retreats of science upon the sunny fields, the green valleys, and broad plains of your country, you hear a thousand voices inviting you to come forth and apply the mental stores which you may gain here to increase the stock of human virtue. A thousand hearts will welcome you into professional life, if you carry with you the desire to be useful.

In the mental history of many of the most useful and successful, who have distinguished themselves in the way of

benevolent action, it appears that they formed their principles of action while in college as well as acquired those means or qualifications for usefulness. In forming your moral and religious principles of action, you enjoy great advantages in the quiet and calm of your situation. Your interests here do not interfere with the formation of correct principles, as they will when you come into the employments of professional life. Let your desire to serve God and bless mankind grow up under your cultivation, in your hearts, as a permanent principle of action. Carry out into the world with you, when you go, a benevolent heart, what stores you can acquire, and a philosophic spirit. Having learned in the retirements of collegiate life to scale the high abode where truth has reared her awful throne, having consecrated your acquisitions, at the foot of the cross, to the service of Him who hung thereon, you will in your earthly progress move in a halo of glory brighter than that which encircles the hero's brow. And, when coming years shall have gathered you to the great home of the dead, to rest from the toils both of studious and of active life, you will, with enlarged capacities and with stores of heavenly knowledge, enter into a brighter scene of action, where you will for ever "drink the spirit of the golden day and triumph in existence."

Having spoken of the value and importance of a liberal education; first, in its influence in elevating and refining the intellectual and moral character of the individual; secondly, in its influence in preparing him for a professional education, that he may act his part among men usefully and successfully; we are next to speak of it in reference to the practical application of the truths communicated during the course. We have dwelt hitherto chiefly on its value and importance as a discipline to the mind; we shall now speak of the knowledge communicated to the students, and through them to the community at large.

This knowledge is frequently underrated in some such language as this: "one ounce of common sense is better than a pound of college learning;" "one grain of mother-wit is better than a bushel of book knowledge." And in illustration of the truth of such assertions, the visionary schemes of learned men are collated with the practical skill of self-taught men, for the sake of throwing contempt on the former.

Now, we have no disposition to underrate "good sense," "mother-wit," or "practical skill;" but, besides these, scientific principles and systematic rules are necessary. And here we would introduce a quotation from Whateley's Logic, to show our views of the case: "The generality have a strong predilection in favor of common sense, except in those points in which they respectively possess the knowledge of a system of rules; but in these points they deride any one who trusts to unaided common sense. A sailor, *e. g.*, will despise the pretensions of medical men, and prefer treating a disease by common sense; but he would ridicule the proposal of navigating a ship by common sense, without a regard to the maxims of nautical art. A physician again, will perhaps contemn systems of political economy, of logic, or metaphysics, and insist on the superior wisdom of trusting to common sense in such matters; but he would never approve of trusting to common sense in the treatment of diseases. Neither, again, would the architect recommend a reliance on common sense alone, in building, nor the musician in music to the neglect of those systems of rules which, in their respective arts, have been deduced from scientific reasoning aided by experience. And the induction might be extended to every department of practice. Since, therefore, each gives the preference to unassisted common sense only in those cases where he himself has nothing else to trust to, and invariably resorts to the rules of art wherever he possesses the knowledge of them, it is plain that mankind universally bear their testimony, though unconsciously and often unwillingly, to the preferableness of systematic, to conjectural judgments." According to this view of the matter, "common sense," and "mother-wit," and "practical skill," are not underrated, while science and systematic rules are exalted to their proper station.

In every age of the civilized world, the conduct and character of the great mass of the community depend on the moral and intellectual influences which operate upon their minds, and these influences descend originally from high sources. They descend from the minds of philosophers, speculating in their closets, to the minds of those leading men in the community who have the more immediate control of the popular sentiment; and from them they go down, as

from so many distinct fountains, to the great level of the common people. Those who are thus engaged in active life cannot, indeed, be expected to devote much attention to original investigation in science and literature, yet they may serve as the medium to transmit to the community the intelligence that comes from the great lights of the world. We cannot stop to speak of those bright constellations which, at different times, rose in the hemisphere of Greece, and shed their choicest influences upon the great men who in public life governed her destinies. Whence was it that Lycurgus was qualified to compose that code of laws which laid the foundations of Spartan greatness? It was from Thales of Crete, the learned and the wise. Whence was it that Solon was qualified to give laws to Athens? "I grow old," said he, "in the pursuit of learning." Whence was it that Pericles became so distinguished as to merit and receive the name of Olympius? From Anaxagoras the philosopher.

From the lyceum, the porch, and the grove, there came forth those statesmen and heroes, furnished with the philosophy of Zeno and Aristotle, who thus, by their superior knowledge, swayed the minds and directed the energies of the Grecian states.

Thus has it ever been. Knowledge is power both in the application of the laws of nature to useful purposes, and in influencing the minds of men. The abstract principles taught in ancient schools or in modern colleges have been diffused more or less extensively through the surrounding communities. In this way the whole mass of the people becomes more or less enlightened.

In order to show that abstract principles, such as are taught in colleges, are actually diffused through the community, and applied to practical purposes, we will refer to the principles taught by Bacon, the father of experimental philosophy. This great man received his education at Trinity College, Cambridge, where, it has been asserted, he conceived the idea of the inductive mode of philosophizing. The end aimed at by Bacon was, to use his own language, "fruit," which means the mitigation of human suffering, and the increase of human enjoyment. He was willing that the tree should be judged by its fruit. Of the method

which he pursued, and which he proposed to others, for the interpretation of nature, and entitled Novum Organon, this is the fundamental axiom, "As man is but the servant and interpreter of nature, he can work and understand no farther than he shall either in action or contemplation observe the proceedings of nature, to whose laws he remains subject." This mode of philosophizing was adopted by Newton, both when a student and when a professor at Trinity College, Cambridge, with great success; as it has been since by multitudes of teachers in colleges, academies, and common schools. Thus it has happened that almost every intelligent man in the community understands something of what is termed the Inductive Philosophy of Bacon. Reflect, for a moment, upon the value of the fruits of his philosophy in every science, whether physical or moral; in every art, whether liberal or mechanical. Think of what it has done in the investigations of the heavens, in the sublime science of astronomy, and in the application of that science; of what it has done in the investigation of the crust of the planet we inhabit, and of the various tribes of animate and inanimate existence. Think of what it has done in mechanical and chemical philosophy; how it has guided the thunderbolt to the earth; how it has enabled man to descend into the depths of the sea, and to soar into the air; to traverse the land in cars that whirl along without horses, and the ocean in vessels which are propelled against the wind. These are some of the fruits of his philosophy, in its application to science and to art. The abstract principles which he brought forward into notice being adopted by kindred minds, and by them communicated to others, or applied to practical purposes, have revolutionized the world in philosophy and the arts.

In illustration of the same fact, we may take the instance of the Newtonian philosophy. At first it was taught, in its general principles, in the universities of Great Britain, and from them was introduced into the universities of the Continent. In the progress of time, a knowledge of these principles was diffused through the community in many parts of the civilized world. This has been done, for the most part, by those who have enjoyed the advantages of a liberal education, as teachers, or as the writers of popular works;

and what is true of this is true of the physical sciences generally.

As a further illustration of the same general fact, we may take the instance of the philosophy of Locke. This philosophy has had a powerful influence in forming the opinions of men in regard to the laws of the human mind; in regard to government, morals, religion, and education. He was educated at the university of Oxford, and was distinguished there as a scholar. His works have been studied in the universities and colleges of Great Britain and this country, and in this way have exerted a controlling influence upon the minds of men.

To take another case. It is now, perhaps, forty years since the president in one of the colleges in South America conceived the design of spreading through the province in which it was situated, correct principles of civil liberty. Accordingly, with the injunction of secresy, he put into the hands of the most promising scholars in each class in succession, one of whom related to us this fact, certain books, which were proscribed by the laws, on the ground that they were hostile to arbitrary power. These scholars, carrying with them the principles of liberty derived from this source into active life, have since kindled the watchfires of revolution, which burned so brightly among the hills and valleys of the Andes. And they are now engaged in establishing the civil institutions of the country in accordance with those principles of liberty which they imbibed during their residence at college.

The results of ethical and metaphysical speculations are equally obvious and striking. They have, in like manner, through the colleges as their appropriate medium, a powerful influence in forming the mind and coloring the intellect and moral principle of all thinking men. The works that came forth from the universities of Scotland, in rapid succession, from such men as Reid, Stewart, Brown, and Hamilton, have effected a revolution in intellectual philosophy no less important than that which was produced by the writings of Locke. Rousing themselves from the lethargy that had long reigned, they awoke the slumbering intellect also of Great Britain, and excited a spirit of investigation, and gave an impulse to knowledge, that continue to the pre-

sent day. They were a light kindled in the North, which, like the glorious emanations on a summer's night, spread far and wide over more southern latitudes.

Our limits do not allow us to show how the systems of philosophy, as adopted by men liberally educated and taught in universities and colleges, have, in successive ages, influenced the faith of the Christian church. Nor can we find room to show the great value of an acquaintance with the laws of nature, in their application to the useful arts; how it prevents us from attempting impossibilities; how it enables us to accomplish our ends in the easiest, shortest, and most economical manner. We need not appeal to the triumphs of practical mechanics, which, for the most part, is a scientific art, nor to the wonderful transformations wrought by chemistry, nor to the application of the science of astronomy to the art of navigation.

But it is said that many of the most successful and important applications of science to the arts, were made by men who were not liberally educated. This is readily admitted; but still it is true that colleges and men liberally educated must come in for their share of honor and merit for these applications. For instance, Fulton had not enjoyed the advantage of a college education, and yet he was the inventor of the application of steam to propelling boats. But it should be remembered that Fulton was upon intimate terms with the celebrated Duke of Bridgewater and with Lord Stanhope, both of whom had a superior education; that he resided some time in Paris with that elegant scholar, Joel Barlow; that he made himself acquainted with the French, Italian, and German languages; that he acquired a knowledge of the high mathematics, physics, chemistry, and perspective; that he was associated with Chancellor Livingston, —whose mind was enlarged by education,—in the enterprise of employing the steam-engine in navigation. It is said of Watt, who brought the steam-engine to a high degree of perfection, that, though he had not received a liberal education at a university, he was conversant with all the wonders of natural philosophy, and was the pupil and intimate friend of Professor Black. And he often acknowledged that his first ideas on this subject were acquired by his attendance on his lectures, and from the consideration of his theory of

latent heat, and the expansibility of steam. In this way, universities and colleges may claim the honor of having educated indirectly, through the medium of their alumni, many who have been the benefactors of their race, by the application of science to the arts.

Colleges have thus, directly or indirectly, changed the whole circle of mechanical employments, from the condition of empiricism to that of scientific art. And, besides furnishing a vast amount of important inventions, abridging human labor, increasing human comforts, they have thrown a clear and strong light upon those processes which had been studiously concealed under the veil of mystery.

Nor are the services which learning has rendered to morals and religion of less importance. It has derived from the Bible, in harmony with nature, a system of pure morals and elevated piety. It has ever sympathized with the truth, and has ever been ready to detect and expose the arts of men who depend for their success on popular delusions. The history of colleges in our own country shows that they were not the patrons of witchcraft, when that was rife in the land; that they did not promote the delusions of Mrs. Hutchinson or of Davenport; that in them mesmerism, and spiritual rappings, and the transient follies of the day find but few votaries.

Let the colleges, then, in our country take their proper position in the public estimation, in connexion with academies, high-schools, and common schools, as the popular and conservative institutions of the land, to be sustained by public sentiment and public contributions.

Art. VI.—Dr. Nevin's Pantheistic and Development Theories.

By the Editor.

In our previous article on Dr. Nevin's views respecting God, creatures, and Christianity, we pointed out the identity of his system with that of Schelling and his disciples, and

showed that he follows them also in founding on that pantheistic scheme, his notion of the nature of redemption, and theory of the development of Christian doctrine and worship. We shall now briefly state a few of the considerations which demonstrate the error and absurdity of those notions.

I. Following, then, in the train of Schelling, the theory on which he founds all his doctrinal speculations is, that the Deity is the only absolute existence; that created things, instead of being separate, are but embodiments of him in finite forms; that man is the highest of those forms; that God had no personality or consciousness, until he unfolded himself in man; that psychical and material things, being but modes of God, all their emotions, passions, thoughts, volitions, acts, and processes, are acts and processes of his nature, and revelations and expressions of his character and will.

To those who have not become utterly bewildered and lost in the labyrinths of a false and atheistic philosophy, but few formal proofs of the error of this system can be necessary.

1. It is wholly destitute, not only of all decisive evidence of truth, but of all such probabilities as sound philosophers universally admit, are indispensable to give credibility to a speculative system. It is not sustained or countenanced by any testimony from God; it is not confirmed or favored by anything in the nature of finite intelligences or material substances. No pretence, indeed, is made by its authors and abettors of demonstrating it by such means. It is put forth as a mere hypothesis, or idea, for the purpose—on the ground of naturalism, or the utter unbelief of the existence of Jehovah,—of furnishing a specious solution of the phenomena of the universe. Schelling founded his whole system on two postulates or facts; that there is a universe, or what is deemed to be a universe, whether real or merely ideal—consisting of finite psychical and material forms; and that this universe has a cause; and his object was on that basis to furnish the most simple and comprehensive explanation of its existence and phenomena. It was to that point that he directed all the energies of his genius; on that, that he lavished all the resources of his learning and ingenuity; and on his success in it, that he rested his expectations of popu-

larity and fame; and for that reason, as one existence is more simple than a multitude, he exhibited the whole as God. His system is accordingly a mere ideal, or fanciful one; a vast fabric reared by a brilliant but lawless intellect, utterly devoid of a true knowledge, either of God or itself. It has not the slightest title, therefore, to be received as a genuine and scientific exposition of the universe. To accept it and build on it as such, indicates the grossest and most pitiable misapprehension of the nature of science, and the most wretched debasement and bewilderment of intellect.

2. It is in total antagonism to the Scriptures. God, everywhere in his word, exhibits himself as wholly distinct from his creatures, and independent of them in the mode in which he exists, in his consciousness, his personality, and his happiness. No grosser contradiction to the delineations he there presents of himself can be conceived, than the representation that he and his material and intelligent creatures are one and the same; that man is the deity in a finite form; that God has no personality nor consciousness, except as he is embodied in humanity; and that all the sensations, affections, thoughts, and acts of mankind, are his; and constitute the highest form of his intellectual being. No one can understandingly receive this system, who does not wholly reject the Scriptures as a divine revelation. Neither Schelling himself, nor any of the great writers who have accepted his system and made it the basis of their doctrinal and historical speculations, regards the Bible as the work of divine inspiration. So far from it, it is in their estimate, a main merit of their theory, that it so wholly contravenes and sets aside the word of God.

3. It offers an equal contradiction also to the consciousness of men. If they were God in a finite form, they would, undoubtedly, be aware of the fact. They would know that they are parts of the divine nature; they would recollect their previous existence in the form of the Absolute; they would be conscious of self-existence, infinite power, omniscience, and know the purpose for which they assumed their present form. It is in utter inconsistence with the perfections of a self-existent and infinite intelligence to suppose it could be otherwise. But men are not conscious of any of these peculiarities of the Deity. So far from it, they

are as perfectly sensible that they are mere created existences, that they lately came into being, that they are extremely limited in their powers, and that they are dependent for life, safety, and happiness on a cause without themselves, as they are of their existence. They are as absolutely certain that God is wholly different and distinct from themselves, and independent of them, as they are that other individual men and the material objects around them are. Such, especially, are the views and realizations of the people of God. Their thoughts, convictions, affections, and desires, as they are delineated in the Psalms, the Prophets, the Epistles, and other parts of the sacred volume, are not capable of being moulded by any process however violent, into harmony with this pantheistic theory; nor can the ordinary convictions, affections, and actions of men. The whole sum of human consciousness, from the first emotion that trembled into being in the breast of Adam, down to the present hour, contradicts it, and fastens on it the brand of immeasurable falsehood and folly.

4. It is wholly incompatible with a moral government over creatures. If creatures are nothing but God in finite forms; and if God has no personality nor consciousness except as he exists in the human form; it is plainly impossible that he can as God, in contradistinction from creatures, establish and exercise a moral government over them. How, without any personality or consciousness apart from them, can he, aside from, and independently of them, institute and administer law over them? The supposition is self-contradictory. An impersonal deity cannot have rights that are personal. An unconscious one certainly cannot express, assert, and enforce such rights. He cannot know that there are beings who can be made the subjects of a moral administration. On the supposition that such beings exist, he cannot know that they sustain any such relations to him that he can have a right to impose laws on them. If they are supposed to be made the subjects of laws, he cannot know that they either transgress or obey them. On such a scheme, a moral government by God, in contradistinction from men, is plainly impossible. On this theory then, if there is a moral government over men, it must be a purely human, in place of a divine one; or, in other words, it must have its origin

wholly with men, and must contemplate them according to their natural, universal, and unavoidable consciousness as creatures, and not as forms or parts of God. And this is, in fact, the relation in which the advocates of this pantheistic scheme contemplate what they denominate the divine government. Human reason is in truth their supreme deity, and they regard what they receive as the Christian religion, and all their other theological tenets, as having their origin in the minds of men; as mere necessary developments of their nature, and as no more the work of inspiration, than any of the other thoughts and beliefs of which they are the subjects. The government of God, in their vocabulary, means nothing more than the various evolutions of the human mind, acting according to its peculiar constitution.

5. It denies the possibility of a work of redemption. In denying that there is any diversity of persons, or any personality whatever in the Deity, it wholly cuts off the possibility of a redemption by the incarnation, obedience, and expiatory sacrifice of a divine person. There can be no redemption by a personal Deity, if there is no divine person to fill the office of redeemer, and make the satisfaction for sin that is requisite to its forgiveness, and the renovation and justification of those who have offended.

In asserting that man himself is God in a finite form; and that God only exists as a personal and conscious intelligence in the form of humanity, it exhibits the lawgiver and the offender as identically the same, and makes God himself the subject as well as the author of redemption. It is not only he that offers and that receives the satisfaction; but he is the party that is delivered from punishment, as well as that is the deliverer, which is impossible. No greater solecism can be conceived.

6. It forms the most awful misrepresentation and traduction of the Almighty, that has ever been embodied in language; as it ascribes to him all the limitations and imperfections of human nature, and all the follies, errors, evil affections, impieties, and atrocities of which men are guilty; exhibits them as the true index of his character; and represents him as the subject of all the inflictions with which they are punished! No other system ever presented such a deformed and hideous picture of his being—no other ever

uttered so boundless a traduction of his perfections. The deity of those who intelligently adopt it, is no more the Jehovah of the Scriptures, the God of our salvation, than Baal or Moloch; and they are no more to be regarded as his worshippers, than the devotees of Diana or of Juggernaut. What astounding infatuation, that men who have, in a measure, had the advantages of a Christian and a philosophic education, should yield their assent to such a revolting scheme, and contemplate it with admiration and pride, as the noblest product of human wisdom, and the highest form of refined culture and sublimated science!

II. Dr. Nevin's theory of Christ and redemption, is a branch of this pantheism, and exhibits the Saviour as no more a divine being than every other individual of the race is; that his only difference from others is, that the Deity, in him, acts conformably to the laws imposed on men; that others, when perfectly sanctified, will be precisely like him in nature as well as character; that the redemption of men, accordingly, consists simply in bringing their "humanity" into the same state as his; or, in other words, causing the Deity to act in them, in the same manner as he does in him; and that that is produced by the administration to them of the sacraments by which, it is held, they are brought into an organic relation to him, and made to undergo a transfusion, or something equivalent to it, of his nature into theirs; that the great object of Christ's mission, therefore, was not to make an expiation for their sins, and to open the way for their renovation by the Holy Spirit, but simply to exemplify the possibility of redemption, and show in his person and life, what man is to be when redeemed; and that his life is the model, therefore, by which believers are to frame theirs.

To those who receive the Scriptures as the word of God, it cannot be necessary to allege more than a very short array of considerations to confute this impious fiction.

In the first place, it is a mere hypothesis, or dictum of these pantheistic speculatists, wholly unsupported by evidence. Not a particle of proof is or can be adduced to verify it. It is a mere figment fabricated for the purpose of completing their speculative system, and giving it the air of accounting for the peculiar forms of thought and belief that prevail

in the Christianized world, respecting the Redeemer and redemption.

In the next place, it is at war, in every relation, with the word of God: 1. In regard to the divine nature, as it denies the existence in the Godhead of a trinity of persons, and treats them as mere modes of agency; and as it denies that Christ is any more divine than any other individual of the race. 2. It totally misrepresents the object of Christ's mediation. Instead of merely exemplifying the nature of redemption, as the theory teaches, and showing what the salvation is which God designs to bestow on multitudes of the race, the object of his mediation was to open the way for the salvation of men, by an expiation and an obedience that make their renovation by the Spirit, and gratuitous forgiveness and justification, compatible with God's truth, righteousness, and glory, and propitious to the virtue and happiness of his general kingdom. He accordingly did not exemplify the redemption he came to accomplish. He was not, himself, a subject of that redemption. He was not renewed by the Spirit. He was not forgiven and justified by grace. He was not raised from death, as from a penalty to which he was obnoxious because of transgression. He was raised because he was perfectly holy, and had suffered death simply as the representative and Redeemer of men. And they who believe on him are *redeemed* by his obedience and death; not simply shown that their life, death, resurrection, and acceptance are to be like his.

In the third place, it totally misrepresents the media or instrumentality by which the sanctification of men is accomplished. They are not sanctified at all immediately by the contact or incorporation in themselves of the sacramental elements, as physical substances. When the sacraments are mediately the means to them of sanctification, it is exclusively by the truths which they express and enforce impressively on their minds; and there is no infallible or uniform connexion, in that relation, between the reception of the sacraments and sanctification. The regeneration and quickening of the mind is the work exclusively of the Holy Spirit, and he accomplishes it, as a sovereign, on whatever occasions and through the instrumentality of whatever truths he pleases.

In the fourth place, the regeneration or change which Christ accomplishes in men, in their redemption, does not consist in bringing their humanity into the same state as his, or that in which Adam was created. The law of sin continues to work in them after their regeneration, and to retain them in captivity; and they continue subject to the infirmities, and degradation, and sufferings of a fallen nature, and remain under the sentence, and finally undergo the infliction of death, the great penalty of sin. They will not become conformed to him, till he comes and raises those of them who have died from the grave; and releasing those of them who are living from the sentence of death, and all the penal effects of the fall, raises them to unspotted purity, and confers on them the gift of immortality;—blessings that are consequences of their regeneration; not regeneration, or elements of regeneration, itself.

In the fifth place: Nor is the life of Christ the exact model of the life believers are to live. They are to aim to be perfectly holy, indeed, in their sphere, as he was perfectly holy in his; but their sphere is widely different from his. Sorrow for sin, reformation, a strife against the evil that lurks within them, and faith in him as their Redeemer, trust in his blood for expiation and pardon, and reliance on him to complete their sanctification and finally raise them to the glories of immortal life, are the great duties to which they are called; but they were not duties to him;—repentance, reformation, faith in the promise of a salvation by grace were unknown and impossible to him. His life in all its great features was as peculiar to him as Redeemer, as his complex nature and the design and effects of his death were; and their lives are in their great features as peculiar to them as regenerated persons, as the redemption from sin and death is, of which they are and are to be the subjects.

Dr. Nevin's theory on this subject is thus, like his pantheism, a tissue throughout of the grossest and most absurd errors.

III. His theory of development, which it is our principal object to treat in this article, is an equally senseless and revolting figment. It represents that Christianity, when communicated by Christ to the apostles and first believers, became to them and to the church universally thereafter,

even denying the Lord who bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction?" On the theory of development, their destructive heresies would be legitimate; the denial of the Redeemer, the genuine dictate of the Christian system; and the result to their authors and abettors salvation, instead of destruction! In like manner, the solemn testimony of John in the Apocalypse, that "if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life," would be wholly reversed, and those sacrilegious acts be converted into virtues, and grounds of acceptance, instead of condemnation and death.

8. This theory totally misrepresents the nature of the process which takes place in individuals and churches, as they advance from one stage of views to another; whether it be by mere accessions of knowledge, or variations of ideas and beliefs. It is the individuals, and the church exclusively, that are the subjects of the change; not Christianity itself,—that is, the body of facts, truths, doctrines, laws, promises, and teachings, which constitute the Christian system, that exist exterior to, and independently of the church which professes to receive them; precisely as a political community is the subject of the change of principle, belief, disposition, and policy that take place in it; and not the constitution and laws under which they live, which are exterior to them, and which continue identically the same. According to the theory of development, however, the fact is directly the reverse. It is the constitution itself of the nation, that changes, as law, opinions, policy, and conduct of parties change, not the principles and action of those parties; and it is Christianity itself that changes, as the doctrines and worship of the church change, not the church itself that varies in its faith and homage. Was there ever a more extraordinary and unpardonable blunder? Did men with such lofty pretensions to science, ever more unfortunately and discreditably darken a plain subject, and confound God with his creatures, and truth with the ignorance, unbelief, or errors of men respecting it.

4. Christianity is not subject to development; it does not,

and cannot change its nature by growth and evolution, so as to be at different stages of its existence essentially unlike what it was at first. The supposition is immeasurably contradictory and absurd. It is to suppose that facts that have already a positive existence, may change their nature; that the basis and principles of God's government may vary and assume different forms; and that institutions that have their ground in unalterable truths and relations, may lose their original, and acquire a wholly dissimilar nature. But Christianity is a positive institution. The principles on which it is founded, its facts, its truths, the great acts which it embodies, its laws, its promises, have a real existence, and are unalterably what they are. They can no more be changed in their nature, than any other facts of history, or truths respecting God and man. The supposition that they can undergo a change by development, like a plant that grows from a seed, and unfolds in a stalk, branches, leaves, flowers, and fruit, so as to be at its several stages essentially larger and different from what it was at first, is as irrational and absurd, as it were to suppose that the birth of Moses, the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea, the destruction of Pharaoh and his hosts, the journey to Sinai, the institution of the law, and the law itself, are capable of such a development, and may become wholly different from what they originally were. These writers, through the whole web of their speculations, confound the changes that take place in the theories, doctrines, beliefs, and practices of the church, with a change of the unalterable truths and realities which those doctrines, beliefs, and practices, respect; than which no two things are more entirely dissimilar, or more widely disconnected. However men may change their opinions, beliefs, modes of worship, and principles of life, Christianity itself remains as unalterably the same as any other truths or facts of history; the attributes, rights, and appointments of God; or the nature, obligations, and necessities of men. It might as well be pretended, that instead of a mere change in the views of astronomers, the number of the planetary orbs, their motions, and the constitution itself of the universe change, along with the new theories that are entertained in respect to them; as to suppose that Christianity varies and becomes unlike what it before was, because men have altered

their notions of its doctrines, and adulterated the worship which it enjoins, by superstitious and idolatrous additions.

5. Christianity is not conveyed from one generation to another, as the theory of development represents, by mere tradition, nor mainly by any other means than the direct teachings of the Bible and the influences of the Holy Spirit. It is no more transmitted by tradition, than arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, or any other branch of knowledge is. Christianity is a positive existence; its great truths, acts, institutions, and promises are absolute facts, and have an unalterable record in the Scriptures; and that record is as directly and absolutely the means of a knowledge of it, as the sun, the planets, and the stars are of a knowledge of astronomy. God addresses our senses and intellects as directly through the one, and makes known to us through it, especially by the illuminating influences of his Spirit, the nature of the great work of redemption, and the scheme of his administration over the world, as he addresses our senses through the heavenly orbs, and makes us aware through them of the great facts of astronomy. The knowledge that is now possessed by individuals and the church of Christianity, has been derived directly from the Bible. Not a particle of it, it may with safety be said, has been obtained through any other medium. Had it not been for that sacred book, Christianity, unless miracles had been employed to perpetuate its existence, would long since have vanished from the earth. How could the witnesses of Jesus have uttered their testimony of him, through the long night of Popish supremacy, if they had not had an infallible record of that testimony to which they could appeal, and by which they could verify the denunciations they pronounced on the apostate powers; if they had had no guide for their faith, but the vague reports, the uncertain opinions, the arbitrary dictates, and the lawless speculations of the weak and erring friends, and the artful and unscrupulous enemies of the truth? How could a Reformation of the church have been wrought in the sixteenth century, had there been no such infallible record of Christian system by which the errors and apostasies of tholic hierarchy could be tried, and shown to be what e? Without the Bible the first step in that great t would never have been taken. And how long

would a pure faith and worship now continue, were the Scriptures struck from existence? Not a day longer than those who are now familiar with their great teachings, and feel their sanctifying power, should survive; the last barrier to the spread of error would be swept away, and the church become the helpless victim of the lawless speculatists and fanatical demagogues, who are now endeavoring to blot out her faith in the Jehovah and the Redeemer of the Scriptures, and lead her into the bottomless gulfs—which, of late, are made to communicate with each other—of Roman superstition, and German infidelity.

6. The novel doctrines and superstitious rites that were introduced into the faith and worship of the church in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, and that now constitute the chief peculiarities of the Papal system, were not developed from Christianity, but were derived from a wholly different source, and were infused into the faith of the church, by an entirely different process. A large share of those false doctrines and superstitious rites, were notoriously drawn from paganism; such as monkery, asceticism, the homage of idols, the deification of creatures; and the rest, like other errors, that continually rise and spread on every hand, had their origin in the ignorance, mistakes, presumptuous speculations, or ambitious aims of weak, ill-judging, or infatuated men. Their false and contradictious nature forbids the supposition that they can have been developed from the Christian system. Darkness cannot be developed from light; discord cannot be developed from harmony; frost from fire, nor death from life; and no more can falsehood from truth. They are direct opposites, and the existence of the one necessarily, as far as it extends, precludes the existence of the other. How can the dogma of the Catholic church, that creatures are to be worshipped, be developed out of the scriptural doctrine, that worship is to be paid exclusively to Jehovah? How can the dogma of that church, that there are many mediators and intercessors, be developed out of the doctrine so emphatically taught in the Scriptures, that there is but one mediator and intercessor between God and man—the man Christ Jesus? How can the doctrine of the gospel, that there is but one expiation, that of Christ, be developed into the doctrine that there are innumerable others

made by the mass? Or how can the doctrine of justification by grace through faith in Christ, be developed into the doctrine of justification by works? These Romish doctrines are not only false, but they are specific opposites of those from which it is held they are developed; and cannot possibly coëxist with them. If those which are peculiar to the Romish system have become genuine constituents of Christianity, it has not taken place by development; but by the excision of the antagonistic parts of primitive Christianity, and the ingrafture of the new elements in their place. Do thorns ever grow on grape vines, or thistles on fig-trees by development? If they are ever made to spring from them, is it not by inoculation? No more are false doctrines and impious rites of worship ever developed out of the true by a natural and constitutional process. When introduced into the faith and practice of the church, as parts of the Christian system, it is by artificial insertion, as violent and unnatural as the ingrafture of a thorn bough on a grape vine, or a thistle branch on a fig-tree. This great fact, which holds as absolutely in theology as it does in botany, is overlooked by the shallow disciples of the development theory. All the parts of a plant that unfold from its seed are the natural product of its constitution; are consistent with each other, and contribute to perfect it and cause it to fill the office for which it is formed. If, in any instance, members of other plants are found incorporated with it, it is instantly known that they are artificial and unnatural insertions. Not so, however, on Dr. Nevin's theory. If he found branches of the poisonous elder, the sumach, the laurel, the thorn, and a score of other useless or deadly shrubs springing from the stock of a Newtown pippin, he would, on the principle of his theory, regard them as the natural evolutions of that apple tree, and essential elements of its nature; for, proceeding professedly on the analogy of the vegetable world, he holds that the various false doctrines, and superstitious and idolatrous rites, that have been engrafted by the Catholic church on the stock of primitive Christianity, instead of foreign insertions, are the natural and necessary outgrowths of that stock, and genuine elements of its constitution when perfected, precisely as the natural branches, leaves, flowers, and fruits of a tree, are the legitimate outgrowths of its root

integral parts of its nature, and essential to its perfection; and this beautiful idea is what he and his learned coadjutor, Dr. Schaf, dignify with the lofty title of "the science" of church history!

7. It completely transfers the office of lawgiver from God to men, and puts it in their power to alter, annul, or reverse the principles and prescriptions of his government, in whatever way they please. A hierarchy, or combination of religious teachers, have only to announce new doctrines, and institute new rites, proclaim them to be the doctrines and rites of the Christian system, and give them, by their example and influence, a currency in the church, and they, by that fact, according to this theory, become integral and genuine parts of Christianity, and entitled to be received as such by the whole community of believers. The Bible is no longer the proper exponent of the Christian system, nor the criterion of truth; the teachings and appointments of God are no longer of authority; men have succeeded to his place, and now alone possess the prerogative of enacting laws, instituting a worship, and appointing the conditions of redemption.

8. It gives a perfect sanction to all the false doctrines, superstitious rites, and unholy practices that have ever gained a place in the church, and to all the impious and debasing religions, also, of the pagan world. The mere fact that a belief on a theological subject is entertained by a community of professed Christians, a worship of any kind offered, and a course of life pursued, is, according to the theory, a proof that it is a genuine outgrowth, and an essential element of the Christian system, as absolutely as the branches, leaves, flowers, and fruit of a tree are the natural outgrowths of its seed, and as genuine and inseparable parts of its constitution, as its stock or root. The addition by the Catholic church of the homage of saints, the worship of idols, the sacrifice of the mass, and the licence of sin in all its forms by indulgences, can no more, according to Dr. Nevin and Prof. Schaf, be regarded as an apostasy from Christianity, than the generation, flowering, and fig-bearing of the fig-tree, can be regarded as processes wholly foreign to the natural and legitimate life of that tree, and perversions of its proper constitution. On their theory, idol-worship, creature homage, the sacrifice of the mass, and the licence and practice of all

the sins that prevail in that communion, are natural evolutions and genuine constituents of Christianity, as much as the grapes of the vine are of that plant, and the leaves, flowers, and fruit of the fig-tree are of that. On their principle, therefore, there can be no such thing as a false religion; for every species, no matter what it is, must be regarded as developed from the true, and carrying on its front the stamp of its divine origin and authority. Thus, polytheism must be held to be legitimate, because it is developed out of the idea of a deity; the worship of angels, men, brutes, and idols, is legitimate, because it is developed from the idea of a superior being, and of worship. The invocation of saints, heroes, and angels is legitimate, because it is developed from the idea of mediation and intercession. The offering of the mass is legitimate, because it is developed from the idea of sacrifice and expiation; and reliance, for justification, on works is legitimate, because it is developed from the idea of merit. And so of every false religion, and false religious notion that has ever gained a prevalence in the world. The process by which the superstitions and impieties of the Papal system are converted into natural and essential constituents of the Christian system, converts with equal success, the animal gods of the Egyptians, the marble deities of the Babylonians, Greeks, and Romans, and the Fetishes of the Africans, into genuine divinities, and the awe and homage paid them into a legitimate and holy worship. It gives a similar sanction, also, to all the impious and debasing acts of which men have ever been guilty. The eating of the forbidden fruit by our first parents was legitimate, because it was developed out of the desire of a higher measure of knowledge, and nearer resemblance to God. The lawless profligacy of the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah was legitimate, because it was a development of the idea of sex, marriage, and enjoyment. The cruel oppression of the Israelites by the Egyptians was justifiable and virtuous, because they were developments of the ideas of dominion, power, and self-interest. The revolt of the Israelites from Jehovah to the service of other gods was justifiable, because it was developed from the idea of worship, and of prosperity and happiness, as consequences of an acceptable religious homage. The rejection and crucifixion of Christ by the

Jews was justifiable and holy, because it was developed from their idea of a totally different Saviour, and a wholly different salvation; and so of every species of crime that men have ever perpetrated; they are all instantly divested by the magic wand of this theory, of their impiousness and guilt, and converted into the most unsophisticated and lofty virtues.

9. This theory is thus in utter antagonism with the Scriptures, and cannot be maintained, except by a total rejection of their authority; for it specifically denies the whole of the great facts and truths on which the government they represent the Most High as exercising, is founded. If it be true, there has never been any such revolt of the race as is recorded in the Bible and is the ground of the work of redemption, the method and conditions of which are described in the New Testament. Nor has there ever been any such apostasy of the heathen nations, nor of the Israelites, as the Scriptures charge on them. There is no necessity, therefore, of such a salvation as Christ is said to have come to accomplish. No such apostasy of the Christian church has taken place as the New Testament forewarns us was to happen, and continue through a long succession of ages. The whole volume that bears the name of God's word, instead of a revelation from him, is made, by the scheme, a tissue of the most gross and monstrous misrepresentations. There is no escape from this conclusion, if the principle of the theory is correct. There is no consistent medium between the rejection of the one or the other as a consummate fiction.

10. And, finally, it had its origin in an undisguised and uncompromising infidelity, and was contrived simply to subserve the necessities of those who, while they reject the religion of the Bible, still wish to establish a human or philosophic religion in its place. Schleiermacher, to whom it is chiefly referable, appears to have been prompted to the speculation in which it was generated, by a wish to shield himself from the disgrace of teaching a religion, in the truth of which he had no belief. Jeered by Goethe and others at the court, and stung not improbably with a sense of his own inconsistency in inculcating a system which he rejected as a fiction, he attempted to raise the Christian religion and the ministerial office from the discredit into which they had there

fallen, by maintaining that, though the Bible is not a revelation from God, yet the ideas of guilt, pardon, redemption, and a future life, are natural outgrowths of the human mind; and that to recognise them, therefore, treat them as realities, and mould them into such shapes, that they may meet the felt necessities of men, is the part of reason, and entitled to approbation even by philosophers. Rejecting, therefore, both a supernatural revelation and a personal God, and believing in no other deity than the pantheistic Absolute of Schelling, he maintained that all the religious thoughts, affections, and acts of men, are but the outworkings of their natures, as parts of the all-pervading Divinity, and are alike, therefore, divine and authoritative; and on that ground his followers completed the edifice of the theory, by maintaining that all the changes that have taken place in the faith and worship of the church, have been by developments from the great primitive ideas of God, of dependence, of guilt, of redemption, and of a future life, which lie at the foundation of the Christian system. By this device, the Christian profession and the office of the ministry were freed, in a measure, from the disgrace of sheer hypocrisy, with which they had become branded, and raised to the level, at least, of a specious naturalism, and invested with the title and honors of a systematic and showy philosophy; and it is fitted only for persons of that class, who, being members of an established church, and obliged, in order to the enjoyment of their offices, to assent to a Christian creed, feel it necessary, in order to escape the scorn and obloquy to which they would be otherwise exposed, to be able to say that they, at least, believe in a Christianity, although it is wholly different from that which is taught in the Scriptures, and the work of a being altogether unlike Jehovah, the God of Israel.

Such is the theory of historical development, on which Dr. Nevin rests his belief in the present existence of Christianity, and maintains that the false doctrines and impious rites of the Papal church are its genuine constituents. It indicates an awful debasement of the Protestant church in Germany, that this senseless dream, under one form or another, is generally received by its doctors, and regarded as the grand device by which Christianity is to be saved from annihilation. It appears now to be the most fashion-

able form of the transcendentalism of the church of Prussia, and gives to the faint spectre of nominal religion which still survives in it, what little substance and shape it possesses.

What likelihood, now, is there that this wretched system is to gain any extensive prevalence here? Twenty-five years ago, it would have been deemed scarcely credible that it could ever find in this country any considerable number of disciples among the cultivated, and especially among the ministers of the church. But the extraordinary delusions that now meet a ready acceptance from persons of all classes, and the rabid spirit of false philosophy, superstition, and atheism that prevails, render it unsafe to presume that any form of error, no matter how senseless or how impious, may not, under the management of a few artful leaders, spread like an infectious distemper through the community, and make crowds of every rank its unresisting and eager victims. And the fact, that the metaphysics in which this theory has its ground, are already held by many, and are rapidly diffusing, gives reason to expect that this result of those atheo-pantheistic speculations will, at length, gain an equal prevalence. It has its basis in the transcendental philosophy; and no one who understandingly adopts that system can possibly believe any other Christianity than that which the development theory contemplates. No one who entertains the idealism of Kant, Fichte, and Coleridge, can by possibility believe in an exterior revelation, an external deity, or an external universe. No one who adopts the pantheism of Schelling or Hegel, can believe in a personal deity, a redemption by such a deity, or a supernatural revelation. The ideas are directly contradictory and destructive of each other; and this is as well understood in Germany, as it is that these theories are entertained there. But unfortunately these monstrous speculations have a crowd of disciples here. They are the fashionable metaphysics of the day. They are taught, in a measure, in many of the colleges and theological seminaries, and a large proportion of those who have been educated during the last twenty years, there is reason to believe, have become, in a degree, imbued with them. But precisely in proportion as these theories are held, the foundation is laid for the rejection of the Scriptures as an authoritative revelation, and for the degradation

of Christianity itself from the rank of a divine institution to that of a mere outgrowth of human speculation and sentimentality, that can be taught or professed only as a specious and pretentious philosophy. Unless, therefore, strenuous efforts are made by the friends of truth to arrest this result, no one ought to deem it improbable that the lapse of a very few years may be sufficient for its development, and on a scale that will endanger the supremacy of Protestantism here, as it has in Germany, whenever any great crisis occurs that either shall render it hazardous to profess it rather than the Roman Catholic faith, or present powerful inducements to fear, the love of ease and wealth, or ambition of power, to pass into open infidelity. Should such a moment arrive, it were absurd to imagine that any who hold this development theory will hesitate for a moment to secure their safety, or grasp the power to which they aspire, by renouncing the Protestant faith, or altogether abjuring Christianity.

Art. VII.—Literary and Critical Notices.

1.—A Brief Commentary on the Apocalypse. By Sylvester Bliss. Boston: J. V. Himes, 1853.

The laws of interpretation by which the author frames his construction of the symbols, are, in the main, those maintained in the Journal. His explications, brief and simple, are generally sustained by parallel or illustrative passages from other parts of the Scriptures; and, in many instances, by quotations from expositors and historians. We do not assent to all his views, and especially those that respect the witnesses, the inhabitants of the earth during the millennium, and the nations that are to be deceived on the release of Satan after the close of that period. They are the reverse, in our judgment, of those to which his principles would lead him; but his construction of the seals, trumpets, vials, and the chief symbols of the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth chapters, are in the main, we think, correct; and are presented with a directness and intelligibleness that adapt them especially to readers,—and particularly the young,—who have not leisure for a minute study of the prophecy. To such, it is worth a score of volumes filled with

the crude speculations and wild dreams of such writers as Stuart and Hengstenberg, who have no other guide in their interpretations than a lawless fancy. They empty the revelation of its true significance, charge it with a false meaning, or deny it any meaning whatever, and mislead and bewilder their readers. Any one possessed of a tolerable share of sense and candor, may gain, without difficulty, from this exposition, a very just and clear view of the great train of events that is foreshown in the visions, from the time of the revelation to the coming of Christ.

2. Address delivered at the University of Pennsylvania, before the Society of the Alumni, on occasion of their annual celebration, Nov. 1852. By George Potts, D.D. Phila., 1853.

It is a favorable omen, that the voices and pens of so many in the sacred office and other professions are of late directed against the errors and delusions that are propagating under the names of science and religion. Some of the most talented and popular writers in Great Britain, and now and then watchful sentinels on the citadel of truth on this side of the Atlantic, are uttering their protests against these new forms of infidelity, rending away the specious disguises in which they invest themselves, and exposing their coarse and repulsive features to the general gaze. That is a main aim of this tasteful and spirited address:—on the duty of our literary institutions and their alumni, at this period of extraordinary excitements and extravagances, to direct the great influence which they exert especially to the conservation and promotion of sound learning, good morals, and pure religion, in opposition to the lawless theories in physics, the quackish speculations in science, and the fanatical delusions, that are now current in almost every sphere of life,—a theme most happily suited to the occasion, and treated with unusual ease, point, and elegance. Among the false assumptions and pretentious speculations which Dr. Potts specifies, are the nebular hypothesis in astronomy, the theory of the antiquity of the earth in geology, the system of chronology founded on the monuments of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, the theory of the evolution of worlds and their organized inhabitants by development; and, finally, the impudent and senseless necromancy which is now spreading like a pestilence through the world; and he points out their unscientific and antichristian character, and exposes and lashes with a well merited thong, the rash philosophy and shallow sciolism in which they have their origin.

3. The Messiah in Moses and the Prophets. By Eleazar Lord. New York: Charles Scribner. 1853.

This volume is the result of biblical studies, pursued through a series of years, during the hours of intermitted application to secular business; and is the testimony of a mature and earnest mind to the Messiah of Prophecy, and the hope of Israel. And the subject especially entitles it to attention. Works of this kind are now peculiarly needed, when so many, calling themselves Christian believers, intimate that we can afford to abandon the defence of the Hebrew Scriptures, as long as the New Testament is not directly impugned —as if Christianity could, in any way, be more insidiously assailed, than by undermining its foundations!

But let it only be proved, that if there is any heaven-born religion for fallen man, its sum and substance must ever be the same; that there is necessarily an intimate and indissoluble connexion between the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; that the Patriarchal, the Levitical, and the Christian dispensations are parts of the same great system; and the New Testament will no longer be extolled to the disparagement of the Old. It will be at once seen that he who rejects the latter is as false to the former as the Jewish rejector of the Christian Scriptures is to the Mosaical writings. So as naturally, it seems to us, he who has found the Christ of the New Testament, will recognise him also in his manifestations to holy men of old; prophecies once dark will seem to be irradiated with the light of his coming; and the student of the Bible, therefore, even while closeted with the prophets, may learn of Christ, as truly as when seated at the feet of the apostles. He too who does not see the Messiah in Moses and the prophets, is a stranger to him who has come; and it is because Christ is not known, or that he is still "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence," that so many have aimed of late, by different methods, to set the Old Testament aside, and to refer it to an age of legendary visions, and rude fables and myths.

The volume before us will answer a two-fold end: it will serve to show that the Old Testament is as essential to our faith and hope in Christ as the New; and that he who is so clearly revealed in the New as the Lord of glory, is the same being that visibly appeared in a form like that of man to the patriarchs and prophets—often called in the Hebrew Scriptures, Jehovah and Elohim. Though in these respects it may not be regarded as original, yet, from the manner in which the subject is treated, we regard it as a decided advance on the works of preceding writers.

In arguing with the Jew, it is necessary to prove that the anthro-

pomorphic Word is the same as the Messenger of the covenant; that he who became flesh and dwelt among us appeared, in the form of that nature which he was ultimately to assume, to Abraham, Jacob, and Moses; that he whom we adore as Immanuel was the God of the Hebrew church; in short, that he who is "all our salvation and all our desire" was "the hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers."

It is, accordingly, the author's object, in the first twelve chapters, to show under what designations the Divine Mediator, the Messiah of promise was revealed; by what local and visible appearances he was manifested and recognised; in what manner he exercised his offices, and how Moses and the prophets wrote of him—thus directing the Jews to Him, "of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write."

In the progress of the work, some collateral topics are introduced with special reference to the present phase of the Jewish mind. It is shown that the Chaldee paraphrasts understood the Hebrew Scriptures as revealing the Messiah in the ways and under the designations which our author has pointed out, and the reason is stated, that the modern versions of the Scriptures have failed to exhibit clearly the Hebrew designations of the Messiah. But that portion of the work which has impressed us most forcibly, relates to the antagonism between the Messiah and the great adversary as carried on through the lapse of ages, by visible agencies and events, and especially idolatry, which is a counterfeit rival system, having its origin in a perversion of the doctrine of mediation. This point is presented in an aspect which strikes us as altogether new, and renders the book, aside from other considerations, worthy of careful thought. But whatever diversity of opinion there may be in relation to the author's views of idolatry, of the origin and purpose of the Chaldee paraphrases, of the design and effects of the Masoretic points, and of the influence of the Gnostic heresies on the early history of Christianity, and of rationalism on the Christianity of the present day, we think that no descendant of Israel can candidly read the volume, without the conviction that the Messiah of his own Scriptures and Jesus of Nazareth are the same; and we trust the author will have the satisfaction of hearing that the work has been blessed to many in Israel. R. W. D.

4. Memoirs of William Miller, generally known as a Lecturer on the Prophecies and the Second Coming of Christ. By Sylvester Bliss. Boston: J. V. Himes. 1853.

This volume is worthy of a perusal by all who take an interest in

the great purposes God has revealed respecting the future government of the world. If the first chapters descend to a detail of incidents that are of little moment, and betray a disposition to exaggerate and over-paint, the main portion of the memoir, which is occupied with the history of his religious life, is not chargeable with that fault, and presents an interesting account of his studies, his opinions, his lectures, his disappointments, and his death, and frees him from many of the injurious imputations with which he was assailed during his last years. He was a man of vigorous sense, ardent, resolute, and upright; he had the fullest faith in the Scriptures as the word of God, and gave the most decided evidence that he understood and felt the power of their great truths. Instead of the ambitiousness of a religious demagogue, he was disinterested; his great aim, in his lectures, was to rouse men from carelessness and unbelief, and lead them to a preparation for the coming of Christ; and his teachings, evangelical, practical, and impressive, were made the means, there is reason to believe, through the blessing of God, of leading many to the saving knowledge of the Redeemer. The false doctrines and fanatical measures into which some of the party ran, in his last years, so far from being countenanced by him, were promptly disapproved and earnestly opposed. Several of the great points which he maintained, such as that Christ's second coming, the resurrection of the holy dead, and the destruction of the antichristian powers, are to precede the millennium, are undoubtedly correct, and were admitted to be so by some of the ablest of his opponents. His great error lay in attemping to fix the exact time of the advent, and he fell into that mistake, 1. By assuming that the period denoted by the 2300 days of Dan. viii. 14 commenced, like the seventy weeks, Dan. ix. 25, with "the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." They, however, began, the language itself shows, during the action of the ram exhibited in the vision, Dan. viii. 3,4, but at what date seems not at present determinable. 2. In assuming that the coming of Christ and destruction of the antichristian host are to take place precisely at the close of the twelve hundred and sixty years. A considerable period, however, and occupied by great events, such as the proclamation of the gospel and the fall of Babylon, is to intervene between the close of the twelve hundred and sixty years, and the advent. 3. In overlooking several great events that are to precede Christ's coming, that have not yet taken place; such as a further drying of the Euphrates, or alienation of the people of the ten kingdoms from their national hierarchies; the slaying and resurrection of the witnesses; the sealing of the servants of God; the fuller proclamation of the hour of God's judg-

ment to the nations; the fall of Babylon; the warning of God's people to come out of her; the return of a portion of the Israelites to Palestine; and the gathering of the beast, false prophet, and their armies to battle at Armageddon. Nothing can be more certain, we think, than that, on the one hand, these events have not yet happened; and on the other, that they are to precede Christ's coming. In considering most of them as passed, however, he followed in the track of the principal recent writers of Great Britain. Instead of surveying the whole field of prophecy, he fixed his eye on the great central event, and, in his intent gaze at its splendors, lost sight of the scenery with which it is surrounded. His other chief errors were the denial that the Israelites are to be restored, that the nations generally are ever to be converted, and that the earth is to be the residence of men in the natural body during the thousand years of Christ's reign. His demeanor, on the confutation of his calculations respecting the advent, was such as might be expected from an upright man. Instead of resorting to subterfuges to disguise his defeat, he frankly confessed his error, and while he lost faith in himself, retained his trust undiminished in God, and endeavored to guard his followers from the dangers to which they were exposed, of relapsing into unbelief, or losing their interest in the great doctrine of Christ's premillennial coming.

5. Reason and Faith, and other Miscellanies of Henry Rogers. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1853.

The essays of which this volume consists, were originally published in the *Edinburgh Review*, and are among the most talented and instructive that have appeared in that work during the last ten or a dozen years. They are written in a peculiarly clear, vigorous, and idiomatic style, display unusual fertility and scope of thought, keen dialectics, and a high moral and critical taste; and deserve to be studied by the young men especially of our country, as happy specimens of a vivacious and effective method of treating such literary themes. The first four, on the life and writings of Fuller, the life of Andrew Marvel, Luther's correspondence and character, and the genius and writings of Pascal, are, in a measure, biographical, and present a vivid and impressive portraiture of the principal qualities by which they were distinguished, and the scenes in which they acted. Many of the criticisms, in the fifth, on the British pulpit, are applicable here. The errors described in the following passage, into which he represents ill-judging and ambitious preachers as sometimes falling, are not unfrequently seen, especially in those who have

just entered the sacred office, and aspire to a reputation for learning and originality.

"Even when the topics are not such as are fairly open to censure, a large class of preachers, especially amongst the young, grievously err by investing them with the technicalities of science and philosophy; either because they possibly suppose they thereby give their discourses a more philosophical air, or because they disdain the homely and the vulgar. We remember hearing of a worthy man of this class, who, having occasion to tell his audience the simple truth, that there is not one gospel for the rich and another for the poor, informed them that 'if they would not be saved on *general principles*, they would not be saved at all!' With such men it is not sufficient to say, that such and such a thing must be, but there is always 'a moral and physical' necessity for it. The *will* is too old-fashioned a thing to be mentioned, and every thing is done by *volition; duty* is expanded into *moral obligation;* men not only *ought* to do this, that, or the other, it is always by some '*principle of their moral nature;*' they not only *like* to do so and so, but they are '*impelled* by some natural *propensity;*' men not only *think* and *do*, but they are never represented as thinking and doing, without some parade of their '*intellectual processes and active powers.*' Such discourses are full of 'moral beauty,' and 'necessary relations,' and 'philosophical demonstrations,' and 'laws of nature,' and '*à priori*, and *à posteriori* arguments.' If some simple fact of physical science is referred to in the way of argument or illustration, it cannot be presented in common language, but must be exhibited in the pomp of the most approved scientific technicalities. If there be a common and a simple name for the same object, ten to one that the latter is adopted. Heat straightway becomes 'caloric,' lightning, the 'electric fluid;' instead of plants and animals, we are surrounded by 'organized substances;' life is nothing half as good as the 'vital principle;' 'phenomena' of all kinds are very plentiful; these phenomena are 'developed,' and 'combined,' and 'analysed;' and, in short, done every thing with, except made intelligible. Not only is such language as this obscurely understood, or not understood at all, but even if perfectly understood, must necessarily be far less effective than those simple terms of common life, which, for the most part, may be substituted for them."

The theme of the sixth article: "The vanity and glory of literature," is eminently suited to the author's genius, and is treated with special vigor, elegance, and effect. The picture he presents of the rapid descent into forgetfulness of the great crowd even of respectable works that annually proceeds from the press, is very impressive.

The influence of most authors even who are popular with their contemporaries, terminates, at the latest, with their lives. Those who write for all nations and all generations, like Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Virgil, Cicero, Bacon, Shakspeare, and Milton, are as few, compared to the multitude, as the statesmen and conquerors are, who have made their history the history of their ages and of the world; and the influence they exert is as superior to that of others, as the impressions made by Nebuchadnezzar, Cyrus, Alexander, Cæsar, Charlemagne, and Bonaparte, on the destinies of the world, were above those of the subordinates who filled the offices in their courts and their armies. In the essay on the right of private judgment, he combats the unscriptural and insolent pretensions of the Romanizing party, in respect to the authority of the church, and the justifiableness of persecution. The most elaborate and important article in the series is the last, on "Reason and Faith; their Claims and Conflicts," in which he treats of the infidel theories of the reigning school of German metaphysicians. and the application of their principles to Christianity by Paulus, Strauss, Schleiermacher, Coleridge, Morell, and other writers, who reject the inspiration of the Scriptures; and points out with much effect the unsubstantial and dreamy character of their speculations; their antagonism to consciousness and common sense; their superficiality, self-contradictions, deceptiveness, and tendency, at length, to land those of their votaries who are unable to extricate themselves from the power of conscience, in the darkest depths of a blind and debasing superstition. Of the pernicious effects of their systems, he says:

"It may be feared that many young minds in our day are exposed to the danger of falling into one or other of the prevailing forms of unbelief and, especially into that of pantheistic mysticism, from rashly meditating, in the cloudy regions of German philosophy, on difficulties which would seem beyond the limits of human reason, but which that philosophy, too, promises to solve—with what success we may see—from the rapid succession and impenetrable obscurities of its various systems. Alas! when will men learn that one of the highest achievements of philosophy, is to know when it is vain to philosophize! When the obscure principles of these most uncouth philosophies, expressed, we verily believe, in the darkest language ever used by civilized man, are applied to the solution of the problems of theology and ethics, no wonder that the natural consequence, as well as just retribution, of such temerity is a plunge into tenfold night. Systems of German philosophy may, perhaps, be advantageously studied by those who are mature enough to study them; but that they have an incomparable power of *intoxicating* the

intellect of the young aspirant to their mysteries is, we think, undeniable. They are producing this effect, just now, in a multitude of our juveniles, who are beclouding themselves in the vain attempt to comprehend ill-translated fragments of ill-understood philosophies—executed in a sort of Anglicized-German, or Germanized-English, we know not which to call it, but certainly neither German nor English—from the perusal of which they carry away nothing but some very obscure terms, on which they themselves have superinduced a very vague meaning."

The disciples of these systems accordingly, there, it seems,—as is conspicuously the fact here—instead of men of superior sense and learning, are amongst the most superficial and flashy smatterers in metaphysics and general literature. The portraiture he gives of them will serve for the tribe, generally, of Kantians, Coleridgites, and Hegelians, on this side of the Atlantic.

"There are, no doubt, some minds among us whose power we admit, and whose perversion of power we lament, who have bewildered themselves by *really* deep meditation on inexplicable mysteries. . . .

"But we are, at the same time, fully convinced that, in our day, there are thousands of youths who are falling into the same errors and perils from sheer vanity and affectation; who admire most what they least understand, and adopt all the obscurities and paradoxes they stumble upon, as a cheap path to a reputation for profundity; who awkwardly imitate the manner and retail the phrases of the writers they study, and, as usual in such cases, exaggerate to caricature their least agreeable eccentricities. We should think that some of these more powerful minds must be, by this time, ashamed of that ragged regiment of most shallow thinkers, and obscure writers and talkers, who at present infest our literature, and whose parrot-like repetition of their own stereotyped phraseology, mingled with some barbarous infusion of half Anglicized German, threatens to form as odious a *cant* as ever polluted the stream of thought, or disfigured the purity of language."

6. Lectures on Pastoral Theology. By the Rev. James S. Cannon, D.D., late Professor of Pastoral Theology and Ecclesiastical History and Government in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Dutch Church, New Brunswick, N. J. New York: Charles Scribner. 1853.

The subjects embraced in this branch of sacred science, have far less frequently been treated in a systematic and comprehensive manner,

than other departments of theology. They are presented here at large, in their natural connexions, and with ample minuteness and fulness. Dr. Cannon commences with a description of the sacred office itself, and of the scriptural method of induction into it. He then treats of the religious, intellectual, and literary qualifications that are requisite for it. Under this head, he dwells especially on the culture that is necessary, in order to a suitable discharge of the two great duties of the pulpit—offering worship and giving instruction—in which he enters at length into the proper mode of prayer and praise, and the subjects, style, and delivery of sermons. He next treats of the sacraments, catechetical instruction, and, finally, of the various duties of the minister, as the exemplar and guide of his people. His views on these various themes, presented in a clear and forcible manner, are eminently sound and scriptural; and his counsels, suited to almost all the exigencies that can arise in a pastor's life, are marked by the practical force, and Christian fidelity and wisdom, which were in an unusual degree characteristic of his own public ministry.

7. The Epistle to the Hebrews, in Greek and English; with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary. By S. H. Turner, D.D. New York: Stanford & Swords. 1853.

Several of the commentaries that have been published in this country on portions of the New Testament, have been little else than disguised copies, or attempted imitations of foreign writers, and, though making ostentatious displays of critical knowledge, exhibit proofs of a sad inacquaintance with the true genius of the sacred writings, and want of sound learning as well as good sense. This volume is free from those faults. Its pages are not occupied with the critical minutiæ of the grammar-school, nor with pompous protestations, at every turn, that the author could have said a thousand times more on his several topics, had there been time and space, or had the public reached such a stage of culture as to be able to grasp so vast a sum of wisdom as he is prepared to communicate. Dr. Turner is a scholar of large attainments, good judgment, and independent and careful investigation; he gives his chief attention to the points that are of most importance, and need elucidation; and indulges in no dreamy speculations, or daring hypotheses; but employs himself in unfolding the great doctrines of the Epistle in a clear and emphatic manner, and, which is high merit, in a style that fits his volume for the use of unprofessional readers, as well as for those in the sacred office.

8. HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY; Vol. V. The Reformation in England, by J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D. Translated by H. White. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1853.

THIS volume more than sustains the expectations excited by its predecessors. It is in better style, having less dialogue, while it is sufficiently minute in detail, graphic in description, and rapid in narrative. It is occupied through near a third of its pages with a sketch of the church from the introduction of Christianity into the British isles to the commencement of the sixteenth century, and traces the Reformation from that date to the fall of Wolsey. It is of peculiar interest in two respects. It presents an uninterrupted series of witnesses for the truth in opposition to the apostate Romish and persecuting civil powers from the nationalization of the Catholic church, under Augustine, at the close of the sixth century, down to the time of Henry VIII. It shows that the Reformation which then began, was occasioned by the publication, by Erasmus, of the New Testament in Greek, and for a considerable period was advanced mainly by that and the Scriptures translated into English by Tyndale; not by the agency of Luther or others abroad. In all its earlier stages, it was almost altogether independent of the similar movement which sprang up and spread simultaneously with it on the continent. Great Britain has been the theatre of a violent struggle between the true and the false worshippers for twelve centuries and a half, and the question at every stage of the conflict has been, whether the word of God is the true and only rule of faith, and of supreme authority; or the dicta of popes, priests, and kings; and a vast army of martyrs have sealed their testimony for Jesus with their blood. How august the certainty that the hour is at hand, when he will call them from their graves in glory, vindicate them, and invest them with sceptres over the world from which they were expelled as apostates and incendiaries. Before that great moment arrives, the ten kingdoms are to be the scene of still another persecution, more remorseless and impious than has ever yet been waged against Christ's disciples. In that the British isles are probably to share as largely in proportion to the number, intelligence, and piety of God's people there as they have in those of preceding ages. May God prepare them for the trial, and give them a victory and crown!

As this volume closes ere the Reformation was completed, it is to be followed by another.

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME VI. OCTOBER, 1853. NUMBER II.

ART. I.—LETTERS TO A MILLENARIAN. By the Rev. A. WILLIAMSON, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Chester, New Jersey. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1852.

IN the notice of this volume in a former number of the Journal, we pointed out the error of several of the considerations by which Mr. Williamson endeavors to show that "the present Jews are not" in any relation "the lawful heirs of the Abrahamic will," namely: 1, the fact that some of Abraham's descendants, as those of Ishmael and Esau, were never subjects of the promises of that covenant; 2, that under the Mosaic polity, the perpetrators of certain offences were punished with death; 3, the pretext that those who apostatized to idolatry and were carried into captivity were exscinded from Abraham's lineage, and ceased to have any relation to the covenant respecting his descendants; and 4, that those who at Christ's coming rejected him, excluded themselves from the chosen people, and ceased to be heirs of any of the blessings that were promised to them.

Having, as he supposes, established these great points, he endeavors to show that they are confirmed by the teachings of the New Testament.

"Paul, in the second chapter of Romans, after proving that circumcision did not constitute them heirs, since they were living under the new covenant, says: 'For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter.' Paul was here speaking of his own time, about twenty-seven years after the death of Christ, and proving that outward circumcision did not then constitute them the seed of Abraham, or properly Jews, but that a change of heart did, and so claimed for himself and his party to be the true Jews, the lawful seed and heirs of the promises of Abraham, or made to Abraham and David. To this we think agree the words of Paul to the Galatians iii. 7: 'Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham;' and, 'If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promises,' v. 29, for, v. 16, 'To Abraham and his seed were the promises made.' Is it not here plainly declared that those who are Christ's by faith are the seed of Abraham, to whom the promises belong, not only that part of the promise which referred to Christ, but all the legacies yet due to the lawful heirs of Abraham; and does it not imply that the other party who rejected Christ, and who now were as distinct from the disciples of Christ, as were ever Gentiles from Jews, were not heirs? though for seven years both parties were circumcised Jews. Nor does it seem to alter this conclusion at all that after some of the Jewish branches were broken off from this Jewish tree which still lives, Gentile converts were more numerously grafted in. The tree remained the same with some changed branches.

"Could the apostle have declared in plainer language that circumcision did not constitute a Jew; that lineal descent from Abraham did not constitute an heir of the promises; but that henceforth, under the gospel dispensation, true believers in Christ are now to be considered the seed of Abraham, and heirs of all the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David, which are still unfulfilled, and so are still due to the house of Israel, and the house of Judah, who are the seed of Abraham. So that if the prophets speak of the house of Israel and Judah, or of the seed of Abraham, &c., of the present time, do they not speak of those who are in Christ, whom Paul calls the seed of Abraham, and heirs of the promises, in opposition to those who claim to be Jews."—Pp. 75–77.

Mr. Williamson here reasons as though the question debated by the apostle in the passages to which he refers, were, Who are the parties contemplated in the promise to

Abraham? "I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee; and I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee for an everlasting covenant; and I will give unto thee and thy seed after thee, the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession." And he assumes that the subjects of that promise are not the lineal descendants of Abraham, any more than individuals of a wholly different descent; but such only as are the children of God by faith, and partakers of the spiritual blessings which are bestowed on the heirs of eternal life; and he accordingly infers, that when the prophets speak of the house of Israel and Judah, or of the seed of Abraham of the present time, they "speak of those who are in Christ, whom Paul calls the seed of Abraham and heirs of the promises, *in opposition to those who claim to be Jews.*" This, however, is very different ground from that on which he proceeded in his previous arguments. In them he admitted that in the covenant with Abraham, those who it was promised should descend from him, who should suffer oppression in Egypt for a period, and who should at length be put in possession of Canaan and enjoy it as an everlasting inheritance, were his lineal descendants, and the offspring of Jacob, who were led up from Egypt, and actually dwelt in the land of Canaan, with the exception of a short time, down to Christ's advent and institution of the new dispensation; and he maintained that they and their children *exscinded* themselves from the Abrahamic lineage, and disinherited themselves of their interest in the promises of the covenant with him, by their unbelief and rebellion. Now, however, abandoning that ground, and the assumptions he founded on it respecting *exscision* from the seed of Abraham and *a forfeiture* of heirship, he endeavors to show that the subjects of the original promise, and the persons denoted by the denominatives used by the prophet—"the house of Israel and Judah," and "the seed of Abraham"—are *believers* exclusively, who have *the faith* which Abraham exercised, and obtain thereby *the justification* to which he attained.

This is truly an extraordinary change of views. If the position he now assumes is correct, none of his previous postulates and reasons are; and his whole argument thus far is thrown away. How can the unbelieving Israelites

have forfeited an heirship to covenant blessings, in which they never had any interest—which were confined exclusively to persons of a particular *character*, without any reference to lineage, and persons of a character wholly different from theirs? How can they have *exscinded* themselves from a class and line to which they never in any sense belonged? What a charming acquaintance Mr. W. exhibits with the grounds on which he argues with so much confidence! What a splendid exhibition of his perspicacity, to devote one half of his volume to the confutation of the doctrine he maintains in the other! There is no method by which he can escape from this unfortunate dilemma, except by retracting the whole of his reasoning hitherto, or else abandoning the ground which he now assumes, and admitting that the covenant with Abraham did not respect those simply who were to exercise *a faith* like his and obtain a similar *justification*, but contemplated his literal progeny alone, of the line of Jacob, without any consideration whether they were universally to be believers or not.

But Mr. W. wholly mistakes the aim of the apostle in the passages to which he refers. Paul is not there inquiring whether according to the representation of the Scriptures, any are of the literal lineage of Abraham, except such as are believers; but is teaching what it is by which men are constituted *the children of God*, and obtain acceptance and eternal life, as Abraham did: and he shows that they become partakers of those spiritual blessings, not by virtue of a natural descent from Abraham, or reception of the seal of the covenant with him, but instead, exclusively by faith in God like that which he exercised, and which is counted to them for righteousness, as his was to him. There were Israelites both at Galatia and Rome who, while they professed Christ, relied for justification on their obedience to the Mosaic law. To correct their error, he taught them that they could not be saved in any way on the ground of law: that so far from it, the very object of their faith in Christ was to obtain justification from *the curse* to which *the law* doomed them; and that it was by a similar trust that Abraham himself found acceptance. "We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the

faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, *that we might be justified by the faith of Christ*, and not by *the works of the law.* . . . Even as Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham:"—that is, his children in the relation in which they obtain the spiritual blessings that are promised in the covenant with him. This was spoken exclusively to his lineal descendants, as is seen from the fact that it was they only who had been placed under the law, and had had opportunity to seek justification by obeying its requirements. He said to them moreover, "Before faith came, we were kept under *the law*, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was a schoolmaster *to bring us unto Christ* that we might be justified *by faith;* but after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster; for ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus: for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." And he added, finally, that in this respect there was no difference between Jew and Gentile, bond and free, or male and female, but all obtain justification by faith in Christ; and that therefore if they were of Christ, then they were "Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," although they did not comply with the prescription of the Mosaic ritual; for the very object and effect of Christ's interposition for them was, to redeem them from the dominion of the law, that they might receive the adoption of sons; and that being sons "God might send forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts," iii. 28, 29; iv. 1–6. The question he discusses thus respects the method by which they who were the lineal offspring of Abraham were to become the children of God, and obtain acceptance with him. On the other hand, he shows that the covenant with Abraham indicated that the Gentiles also were to be justified by the same method. "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen—the Gentile nations—through faith, announced beforehand the glad tidings unto Abraham, in the promise, 'In thee shall all nations be blessed.' So then they which be of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham." Gal. iii. 8, 9. He thus in these passages treats exclusively of the method in which

Israelites and Gentiles obtain justification with God; not of the question, as Mr. W. imagines, whether the lineal descendants of Abraham, or believers merely, whether Israelites or Gentiles, are heirs of the promise of a perpetual national existence and possession of the land of Canaan. There is accordingly no such confusion of the two races, or conversion of the Gentiles into the house of Israel and Judah, because of their justification by faith, as Mr. W. represents. So far from it, the clearest discrimination is maintained between them; the Israelites being exhibited as still Israelites or of the lineage of Abraham, who had formerly been subject to the Mosaic law; and the Gentiles exhibited as still Gentiles, while it is shown that the method in which they are justified and put in possession of the spiritual blessings with which Abraham was distinguished, is, notwithstanding their different nationality, precisely the same.

But Mr. Williamson's notion is finally confuted by the fact that none but the lineal descendants of Abraham are, in these or any other passages of the Old or New Testament, denominated his seed. He is wholly mistaken in the impression that mere Gentile believers are ever denoted by that term. That it is always employed in the Old Testament to signify his lineal offspring admits of no debate. Thus, in the original promise to him, those who are called his seed are defined as those who were to descend from him. "And Abraham said, behold, to me thou hast given no seed, and lo, one born in my house is mine heir. And behold the word of the Lord came unto him, saying, this shall not be thine heir, but he that shall come out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them; and he said unto him, so shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness."—Gen. xv. 4–6. Here the seed that was promised him, and in respect to which he exercised the faith that was counted to him for righteousness, is expressly declared to be his own literal offspring, in contradistinction from the offspring of his steward, or any other that had been born in the rank of a servant in his family; and the belief accordingly by which he was justified, had reference exclusively to that literal

lineal seed, not to any other. To suppose that another race was also included in the promise, and that that race was finally to take the place of, and absolutely exclude his, is to suppose that he had no conception whatever of its true meaning; and that the faith, therefore, which was counted to him for righteousness, was no faith at all, in a most important part of that of which it is represented as a belief. The promise was equally specific and explicit also in all the other instances in which it was given. Thus in the assurance that he should be the parent of many nations, it is expressly shown that those nations were to be his lineal descendants. "Behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations; neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be called Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made thee; and I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will *make nations* OF THEE, *and kings shall come out of thee.*"—Gen. xvii. 4–6. And it was with this line of lineal descendants that God established the covenant which he made with him, and to them that he gave the land of Canaan as a perpetual possession. "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee; and I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God."—Gen. xvii. 7, 8. No language could possibly define the subjects of the covenant more absolutely as Abraham's lineal offspring to the exclusion of all others. This is confirmed likewise, in the clearest manner, by the promise to Sarah. "And God said unto Abraham, as for Sarai, thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her; yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother *of nations;* kings of people shall be of her. Then Abraham fell upon his face, and said in his heart, shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear? And Abraham said unto God, Oh, that Ishmael might live before thee! And God said, Sarah, thy wife, shall bear thee a son, indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac; and I will

literally the parent; and next as Isaac, his son by Sarah, in exclusion of his other son, Ishmael. No expressions could have been used that would have more absolutely limited the meaning to Abraham's literal offspring by Sarah and his descendants. It is used in the same sense also in the following passage: "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham or his seed through the law, but through the righteousness of faith; for if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect. . . . . Therefore, it is of faith, that it might be by grace; *to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed;* not to that only which is of the law, but that also which is of the faith of Abraham"—that lived between the date of the promise and the gift of the law—"who is the father of us all, as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations, before him whom he believed; . . . . . who, against hope, believed in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken, so shall thy seed be. And being not weak in faith, he staggered not at the promise of God; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God . . . . and therefore it was counted to him for righteousness."—Rom. iv. 13–22. Here the seed of Abraham, and the many nations of whom it was promised he should become the father, are explicitly defined as the seed who was promised and born to him of Sarah, and the seed of that promise, the belief of which was counted to him for righteousness, which was his literal son Isaac, Isaac's son Jacob, and Jacob's descendants. Such is its meaning also, Gal. iii., "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one: and to THY SEED, which is *Christ*," v. 16. "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," v. 19. That in the first of these verses it is used, as in all the passages before quoted, to denote Abraham's lineal offspring, is seen from the express exclusion of all other races; the limitation of the promise to his lineage; and the identification of that lineage as Isaac's and Jacob's, of which Christ was born. It is used with equal certainty also, with the same meaning, in the other verse; first, because there is no reason for assigning it any other signification; and next, because those with whom

the apostle was reasoning were Jews; as is seen from the fact, that previously to their faith, they had been under the Mosaic law; and the law had been as a schoolmaster to them to bring them to Christ. They were Israelites, therefore, as they alone had been placed under the Mosaic law. It is used also in that sense (v. 19) in the expression, "the law was added, because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made;" as that is previously declared to be Christ, who was of the lineage of Abraham. It has the same sense likewise, Acts vii. 5, 6, "He removed him into this land wherein ye now dwell, and he gave him none inheritance in it; yet he promised that he would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him, when as yet he had no child. And God spake to him in this wise: that his seed should sojourn in a strange land; and that they should bring them into bondage, and entreat them evil four hundred years." So also, Heb. xi. 17, 18, "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten, of whom it was said, that in Isaac shall thy seed be called." There is no room for question that in all these instances it denotes Abraham's lineal offspring.

That that is its signification also in all the other instances in which it occurs in the New Testament is equally certain; as Heb. xi. 11, "Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age." Luke i. 54, 55, "He hath holpen his servant Israel in remembrance of his mercy, as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever." John viii. 33, 37, "They answered him, we be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man. I know that ye are Abraham's seed, but ye seek to kill me." Rom. xi. 1, "I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin." 2 Cor. xi. 22, "Are they Hebrews? so am I. Are they Israelites? so am I. Are they the seed of Abraham? so am I." Heb. ii. 16, "For verily he (Christ) took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." The term does not, in any of these instances, admit any other sense than Abraham's lineal offspring; and these, with those before quoted, are all the passages in the New Testament in which it is used in relation to him.

The assumption thus on which Mr. W. proceeds with so much confidence, that the terms, "the seed of Abraham," and Abraham's "seed," are sometimes used in the Scriptures to denote believing Gentiles, is wholly mistaken. Not a shadow of ground exists for the pretext. It were not a grosser error to maintain that Abraham himself was a Gentile instead of a Hebrew. This error is not peculiar, however, to Mr. Williamson. There are many commentators who regard the apostle as representing Abraham as the father of all Gentile believers, and as implying therefore, that they are included in the seed that was pledged to him in the promise, the belief of which was counted to him for righteousness: The passages, however, to which they refer as authority for this opinion, yield it no support.

The first is Galatians iii. 29; "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." But this does not teach, as Mr. W. and others would have us understand, that it was by their being Christ's, that they were constituted Abraham's seed. So far from it, it was addressed, as we have already shown, to those who were in fact of Abraham's lineage, and had been placed under the law as a schoolmaster, in order that they might be led to Christ. The meaning accordingly is, that if they who were Israelites by descent, had in fact been led by the law to Christ, then they were in truth, in the highest sense, the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise. It gives no support therefore to the doctrine that *Gentile* believers in Christ are also Abraham's seed.

The second is Rom. iv. 16; in which Abraham is said to be "the father of us all." But that has an exclusive reference to his own lineal offspring; as is shown by the apostle's quotation in proof of it, of the original promise, that God would make him "the father of many nations." "The promise therefore is of faith, that it might be of grace, to the end that it might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law"—that is, to that part of his lineage whose period was betwixt the institution of the law at Sinai, four hundred and thirty years after the promise was given, and its abolition at the death of Christ—but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all," whether living betwixt the date of the promise, and the imposition of the law in the wilderness; or after the law was superseded

by the gospel. "As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations." These nations accordingly are in the next verse expressly defined as his lineal descendants. "Who against hope believed in hope, *that he might become the father of many nations according to that which was spoken*, SO SHALL THY SEED BE;" which is the promise that the many nations of which he was to become the father, should "come forth out of his own bowels," in distinction from being merely born in his house, Gen. xv. 4, 5. And finally, this is placed beyond doubt by the next verse, in which it is stated that he believed this promise, notwithstanding the deadness of his own and Sarah's body seemed to render his becoming the father by her of a son, impossible—which shows that the nations of whom he believed he was to be the father, were the nations that were to descend from him by her, and to be therefore his lineal offspring. This passage thus confutes, instead of sustaining the construction given it by those commentators.

The third which they allege is, Rom. iv. 11, 12, of the import of which they equally misjudge. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of them that believe though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham, which he had yet being uncircumcised." The term father, in the first and second of these clauses, is used in its literal sense, to denote Abraham's relation to his lineal offspring; manifestly first, from the consideration that the argument has reference exclusively to his lineal descendants. This is seen from the question—"What then shall we say that Abraham our father, hath obtained in respect to the flesh?" which it is the apostle's object to answer. That question relates to the covenant with Abraham, therefore, the seal of which he received in his flesh, and that covenant, Gen. xvii. 1–14, respected him and his lineal seed, exclusively, with the exception of the servants of his house; there is no allusion in it to other nations. The apostle accordingly in the last clause, calls him "*our father* Abraham," and afterwards, v. 16, declares him to be the father

of us all," meaning, as we have already shown, the "many nations" who it was promised should descend from him by Sarah. Next, as the covenant of which circumcision was the seal, related exclusively to his lineal seed, that rite can have been the seal of that covenant only to his lineal seed on whom it was imposed, and could have indicated his relation as their father, therefore, only to believers of his own lineage. How could it bespeak his relation as father to races, or to individuals of races, who were not themselves circumcised? How could it be a seal in any relation, to such as only knew it as a foreign rite, which not only was not obligatory on them, but which, after the institution of the gospel, it was an offence to practise? That it showed him to be the father of those who received it, or that they were his lineal offspring, is plain; inasmuch as it was the seal of God's covenant with him and his lineal offspring; or a badge which they bore as his children; and it was to them a pledge that justification is by faith: but it was no such proof or pledge to other races, who neither had the seal itself, nor were parties to the covenant of which it was the seal. As the only way then, in which it showed that those who received it were his lineal children, was, that it was the peculiar badge of his lineal offspring; so that was the only way in which it showed that he was the father of those who bore it, and was a token to them that if they believed God, their faith also would be counted to them for righteousness. This is seen also from the consideration that the meaning of the statement, "he received the sign of circumcision εἰς τὸ εἶναι πατέρα in order that he might be father of all those that believe"—is not that he was *constituted* their father by that rite. It was not by his being circumcised, that he was constituted the father of his offspring; nor father of them who believe. If he is, in fact, the father of believing Gentiles, it must undoubtedly have been his *faith* that constituted him such, not his circumcision. The meaning of the expression "that he might be the father of all who are circumcised and who believe," therefore, plainly is, merely, that he might be *seen* or *shown* to be their father; and that was shown by their bearing the badge which marked them as his lineal offspring. The apostle's language and argument, thus viewed in every relation, indicates that the term father is used by him in its literal signification, to

denote him as the parent of his lineal offspring. And this is confirmed by the consistency of that literal use of the term with the apostle's statement that Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had while uncircumcised, that he might be *the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised*, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also. For as the sign was affixed to only one sex of his offspring, there were myriads, and probably millions of his lineal descendants, who believed and were justified by faith, who nevertheless were not subjects of the rite; and there were periods, there is reason to believe, when many of his male offspring also, who had faith, through the peculiar condition of the nation, or the negligence of parents, were not circumcised. As the literal meaning of the term father is thus required by the apostle's object, and is consistent with all the propositions which he utters, there is no necessary nor justifiable reason for assigning it any other signification.

Should it, however, be thought that this conclusion, though sustained by so many considerations, is not without difficulties, and that it still may be deemed possible that the apostle meant to exhibit Abraham as the father of Gentile believers, as well as believers of his own offspring; the passage nevertheless, even in that view, yields no support to Mr. Williamson's theory. For the term father, on that construction, can only be used metaphorically, to denote that Abraham, as their head or example, held a relation to Gentile believers in some respects *like that of a father*, and implies therefore, only that they sustain a relation to him that is in some respects *like that of lineal offspring*. Mr. Williamson, however, everywhere assumes and represents, that believing Gentiles are the *real* seed of Abraham in the sense in which his own children were, according to the terms of the promise and covenant; and his argument depends for its validity on the truth of that assumption. If Abraham is not the father of Gentile believers in the sense in which it was promised, he should be the father of the seed that was pledged to him by Sarah, the belief of which promise was counted to him for righteousness; and if such believers are not his seed in identically the sense in which Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve nations that sprung from him were; but are only like his

offspring, in the fact, that they also are subjects of a promise made to Abraham, that all nations should be blessed through him; that they walk in the steps of Abraham in believing the divine promise; that they resemble him and his believing offspring in being justified by faith; then their relationship is *not that* which Mr. W.'s argument assumes and represents. If they are only *like* the real seed, they cannot be the real seed itself. If he is only metaphorically their parent, he cannot be their *real father*. He cannot be their father therefore in the sense of the promise to him of a seed of the covenant, respecting which circumcision was the seal: nor can they be his seed in the sense of that promise and covenant, which respected his lineal offspring only.

The whole ground on which Mr. Williamson builds his argument, is thus swept from beneath him. Grant him all that he can claim from this or any other passage, and it confutes, in place of confirming his theory; as it shows that Gentile believers are not the seed of Abraham in the sense of the promise and covenant, and sets aside the pretext therefore, that the lineal seed pledged in that promise have been excluded, and Gentile believers substituted in their place, and made the parties whom that promise literally denotes. His whole notion is a sheer absurdity, not only without a trace of authority in the word of God, but built on the boldest and most inexcusable perversion of its clear and indubitable teachings.

It is not necessary to pursue him through the remainder of his volume, in which he endeavors to show that there are no predictions or promises in the word of God, of the final restoration and redemption of the Israelitish people; as he proceeds in it, on the same groundless assumptions as in his previous arguments, and assigns to the language of the prophets the same arbitrary and false meaning. Our readers, indeed, will perhaps think we have already bestowed on it a larger share of attention than it merits; but we deem it important that its mistaken principles, and its extraordinary violations of the Scriptures, should be pointed out, that it may be seen what the expedients are to which he found it necessary to resort, to give a color of truth to his pretext, that the Iraelites are no longer the people whom God promised to Abraham as a seed, and engaged to perpetuate in a covenant relation to himself.

Art. II.—False Teachers; Their Character and Doom.

BY THE EDITOR.

Periods that are marked by the prevalence of great doctrinal errors, are usually periods also of false notions of piety, or vague and mistaken judgments of the characteristics that distinguish believers. And very naturally. As departures take place from the faith once delivered to the saints in regard to God, the method of redemption, or the nature of the salvation which Christ bestows; equal departures from the teachings of the Scriptures result almost of necessity respecting the nature of the views and affections that are the constituents of genuine piety, and distinguish the true from false worshippers. That the present is a season of numerous and fatal doctrinal errors, is very generally admitted. There is scarce an essential truth in the whole circle of theology, that is not questioned and rejected by some part of the church. Some of the most palpable, the most wide-reaching, and the most deadly errors that have ever risen, involving the subversion of the whole Christian system, are openly proclaimed from the pulpit, disseminated through the press, and taught systematically even in theological seminaries. Their propagators, however, lose thereby, with a large part of the community, very little either of reputation or authority. It is no obstacle whatever to their retention of their offices; it is no barrier to their recognition as true teachers and ministers of the gospel, by ecclesiastical bodies who profess to reject those errors. There have been repeated instances within a few years in which such bodies have openly treated what they admitted to be, or affected to regard as great errors, as of little significance, and proclaimed to the world that in their judgment, the denial of the fundamental truths of Christianity, and adoption of the most false and pernicious notions in their place, is no proof of a want of piety, and no disqualification for the office of a Christian teacher. And the impression seems to be widely spread through the church that there is scarce any doctrinal error that may not be held by persons who are truly sanctified; and that there is nothing therefore in their speculations themselves of any of the false

teachers of the day that shows that they are not after all the genuine disciples and ministers of Christ.

Such is not the view, however, that is given of false teachers in the Scriptures. The character there ascribed to them, is that of apostates. They are exhibited as indubitable enemies of God, as displaying in their career the most decisive proofs of treachery and malignity; and as left of him to carry out their principles to their natural results, and meet the retribution which such a course justly draws after it. Thus the man of sin, the representative of the great series of apostate teachers in the Greek and Roman churches, from the third century to the present time, is exhibited by Paul,—not as merely an imperfect believer; not as a well-meaning, though mistaken minister of the gospel, whose labors, notwithstanding their defects, are blessed and made the means of salvation to men; and who, despite his apostasy, is at last to meet the gracious welcome of a good and faithful servant; but instead, is depicted as a direct antagonist of God, a usurper of his titles, rights, and honors; an intruder into his temple and throne; and as resorting in his attempts to carry out his impious claims to all the treacherous arts which Satan himself employs to beguile his victims; and as using all the deceits and hypocrisies that unrighteous men employ to pass off their cheateries on the credulous and deluded. "Let no man deceive you by any means"—into the belief that—"the day of the Lord has come"—"for" it cannot be "except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. And then shall that wicked one be revealed—whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. For this cause God shall send them strong delusions that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.' 2 Thess. ii. 3–12. What delineation was ever drawn from which there was a more absolute exclusion of every trace that can belong to the children of God? What portrait ever

presented the haggard features of a daring and impious enemy of him and his government in more unmistakable distinctness and completeness? To suppose that piety, after all, may lurk under such a visage, that such a diabolical aspect may nevertheless be the expression in a measure of the guilelessness, meekness, truth, and love that reign in the hearts of God's people, is to confound sin with obedience; is to mistake the darkness of hell for the serenity of heaven.

A very similar character is given by the apostle of the individual false teachers who were to arise in the last times. Instead of adhering to the gospel, they are represented as departing from the faith, and giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of demons. Instead of being upright and sincere, they are exhibited as deliberate deceivers, speaking lies in hypocrisy; in place of shame or remorse, they are described as having their conscience seared with a hot iron, so that they are not disturbed in the perpetration of their crimes by compunctious emotions. "The Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry; and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." Do any of the traits in this hideous portraiture belong to the children of God? The same character is ascribed to them also by Peter. "There shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction: and many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of: and through covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you; whose judgment now of a long time lingereth not, and their damnation slumbereth not." The heresies or parties which these ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, false teachers, are to introduce, are to be αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας, heresies of perdition; that is, parties, whose very business is to lead men to perdition—or of whose ministry that is the natural result; and they are themselves as false and malignant as their doctrines are; for they are prompted to their course by a sordid and lawless selfishness; and they resort

to all the arts of hypocrisy and deceit to accomplish their objects, selling their victims like merchandise for money; and duping them to consent to the sale by feigned words, and deceptive assurances that it is to issue in their everlasting welfare. And such is the portraiture that is given of them in every part of the word of God. They are wolves in sheep's clothing, whose object is to make a prey of the flock and glut on it their appetites; and who, accordingly, sometimes make it the instrument of their sensuality, "having eyes full of adultery and that cannot cease from sin;" sometimes of their avarice, having a heart "exercised with covetous practices" and following "the way of Balaam who loved the wages of unrighteousness;" and sometimes of their ambition, and pride, "despising government," speaking "evil of dignities," uttering "great swelling words of vanity," and exalting themselves even above God, and endeavoring to reign over his subjects.

And such must necessarily be the character of those who reject the great things of God and his salvation, and teach a false system in their place. They cannot have been born of the Spirit, or they would not apostatize from the fundamental truths of the Christian system, and in their stead embrace a lie. "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin;"—it is no longer his reigning character—"for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil." A change is produced in regeneration that is radical and lasting. The selfish and malignant principles and affections that had before been predominant, are disarmed, and love, awe, trust, submission, and other holy affections enthroned in their place. And that revolution is wrought through the instrumentality, or in the presence of the truth. They are begotten through the gospel. They are sanctified through the truth. A discovery is made to them in that decisive moment, of the glory of God's character, and it is in the vision of its grandeur that they are transformed from enmity to adoration and love. They see, from the contrast, their own character; the work of redemption is unveiled to them; they discern its beauty; they feel its suitableness to their wants, and embrace Christ as their Saviour in a rapture of trust, peace, and hope.

And these great realities flashed on them with a dazzling effulgence, and giving birth to such new and transporting affections, are never afterwards effaced, but remain under the quickening influences of the Spirit, like a new pervading and predominating nature, and exert their power in the same form, and rekindle and perpetuate the same love, awe, adoration, trust, joy, submission, humbleness, hope, and peace that sprang into being under their first impression. That they should subsequently give rise to directly opposite affections is obviously impossible. It is as impossible also that directly opposite views should ever be the ground of these peculiar affections. If a wholly different and false view of God, of his government, of the work of redemption, of the nature of salvation, is the ground of love, trust, joy, and hope, it is an infallible proof, that no true knowledge of God has ever been attained; and no true love of his character and submission to his authority has ever been felt. "Whosoever is born of God, sinneth not: but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not." "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." To suppose that an apostate whose faith is essentially false and in direct antagonism to the truth, can be a child of God, is as absurd, therefore, and self-contradictious as it were to suppose, that the love and worship of God himself may wholly change their nature, and enmity become adoration, and rebellion obedience.

The doom of such teachers is accordingly to correspond to their character. Rejecting God in the very relation in which they must submit to him in order to become his children; refusing the salvation he proffers, and building their hopes on a wholly different foundation, he abandons them to the sway of their false principles and evil affections, and leaves them to meet the ruin to which they naturally lead. The strong delusions which they love, are allowed to prevail over them, and they are left to surrender themselves to the false beliefs which they cherish, that they may be seen to be what they are, and that the condemnation and punishment which they meet may be shown to be in conformity with their character.

Who then are these teachers, whose false doctrines form such decisive proofs that they are wholly strangers to God? What are the errors that constitute such an apostasy from him, as to render it thus certain that those who entertain them have no share in his salvation?

All errors are of that class that involve a direct rejection of Jehovah, and the substitution of a false Deity as the object of homage in his place. He that cometh unto God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. He must approach him as a real existence, and must acknowledge and adore him in his true character and relations. Otherwise his homage, instead of being addressed to him, is directed to a wholly different being, or to a mere conception. Not to retain him in knowledge, but to change the glory of his incorruptibleness into an image made like to corruptible man, and birds, and four-footed beasts and creeping things, and transform his truth into a lie, is to worship a creature instead of the creator, and in place of glorifying, to offer the highest affront to his majesty.

All errors are of that class that are a direct rejection of Christ as a Redeemer, and a substitution of another being in his place as a Saviour. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God. And this is the spirit of antichrist." As a specific acceptance of him in his true character as Redeemer is an indispensable condition to a participation in his salvation; a rejection of him is a direct rejection of that salvation, and necessarily debars from its blessings. To set him aside and substitute another in his place as an object of trust, is to deny him in the most offensive form, and build on one who has no existence as a redeemer, and if not a nonentity, has none of the powers or prerogatives that are requisite to the bestowment of redemption.

All errors are of that class that exhibit salvation itself as of an essentially different nature from that which Christ

bestows; or represent it as obtained by a method wholly different from that in which he confers salvation on those whom he redeems. He is to be accepted and trusted for such a redemption as he bestows; and he is to be accepted and trusted for that redemption in the precise method in which he confers it. To trust for a salvation of a wholly different nature, or for a salvation bestowed on wholly different grounds, and through different means, is not to trust him. It is to trust an unreal being; a fiction of the fancy; and for a redemption that is equally unreal.

What forms of error, then, now prevail that may justly be considered as falling within these classes? What false teachers are there at the present day whose deity is wholly different from the Jehovah of the Scriptures? What teachers are there whose Redeemer is a wholly different being from Christ? and the salvation for which they look, an essentially different salvation from that which he bestows? and who are, therefore, to be regarded as apostates from God, that are indubitably to perish? We shall not attempt a full catalogue of them, but shall content ourselves with identifying a few of the most conspicuous and influential who hold a place in the church, and are engaged in the propagation of their destructive doctrines.

I. Of those, then, whose deity is wholly different from the Jehovah of the Bible, the first whom we shall designate, are the philosophic speculatists of the Kant and Coleridge school, whose God is a mere idea or conception, not a real, independent, self-existent intelligence. That character of their deity is not only openly avowed by them, but results necessarily from their theory of man and the universe. They maintain that all our perceptions of external, and our ideas of immaterial existences, are the mere creations of the mind itself, in the same sense as the shapes and fancies of dreams are; and that it is the mind accordingly that gives to the objects which they appear to respect, all the outwardness, realness, and independent existence, which they seem to possess. The universe is to them, therefore, altogether conceptional or ideal. It is the work of the mind, and exists only within it, or only as it is involved in the fleeting train of its delusive perceptions and ideas. There is nothing without that corresponds to these forms of

thought, or that is in any sense their ground or subject. Nor do they furnish any proof of the existence without of a universe or God that corresponds to them. There is no logical connexion of the one with the other. If the mind is the absolute cause of all that takes place within it, that which takes place within it, plainly cannot indicate the existence of another and wholly different cause of itself existing exterior to the mind, and acting antecedently and independently of it. On their theory, therefore, an external universe, and an external, independent, self-existent, and infinite intelligence, creating and upholding it, cannot by possibility be the objects of knowledge to man. They cannot be *supposed*, without a contradiction of the system, to come within the sphere of our perceptions. If they in fact exist, they cannot reveal themselves to us; they cannot be brought within the sweep of our apprehensions, any more than though they had no being, or more than though we were ourselves devoid of intelligence. The God of Kant and Coleridge, therefore, by the necessity of their system, is a mere idea or conception that is the product of the mind exclusively, and that has no connexion whatever with anything external to the intellect that generates it; and thence has nothing external that answers to it, and of which it can serve as the name. This they expressly teach. "If we cannot have objective certainty beyond the limits of sense"—which on their theory are wholly interior—"what becomes of our ideas of substance, of the soul, of God—ideas which all admit to be noumenal or supersensual?" "Reason," says Kant, "*can never assure us of their existence;* attempt to deduce them, and you fall into endless paralogisms:—as *ideas* they exist, but *only* as ideas, for the senses cannot clothe them with outward reality."—*Morell's Hist. Phil.*, p. 172. The same views were entertained by Coleridge. He says, "Out of the principles necessarily presumed in all discursive thinking .... the human mind .... forms certain essences to which, *for its own purposes*, it gives a sort of *notional subsistence*." ... "The stablest and most indispensable of those notional beings" .... are "but the necessary *forms* of thinking taken abstractedly; and .... *they subsist wholly and solely in and for the mind that contemplates them.* Where the evidence of the senses fails us, and beyond the precincts of sensible

experience," that is, beyond the processes of our minds, "there is no reality attributable to any notion but what is given to it;" that is, but what is merely conceptional or supposititious. He holds accordingly that God has no reality but what is thus gratuitously ascribed to him. "The hypothesis of a ONE ground and principle of the universe;" that is, of a something that forms the universe out of itself, though "necessary as *an hypothesis*," yet he holds, has "*only* a *logical or conditional necessity*," and it is by that hypothetical process, he maintains, that it is "raised into *the idea* of *the* LIVING GOD, the supreme object of our faith, love, fear, and adoration."—*Aids to Reflection*, p. 100. His god, therefore, is nothing but a mere idea generated by the laws of his mind, to which, for a mere logical purpose, he gratuitously ascribes a simply conceptional or imagined reality; while the principle of his theory formally denies, not only that God has an actual, independent existence, but the possibility also, on the supposition that he had a real external existence—of his being an object in any relation of our perception or knowledge.

These speculatists then, and those who adopt their philosophy, are undoubtedly false teachers and apostates. They as specifically disown and reject the Jehovah of the Scriptures, as they could if they denied that there is any god whatever. Their deity is as unlike and as exclusive of him, as Juggernaut or Baal. He is, by their own definition, a sheer nonentity; neither being an object of knowledge, nor having any external existence. Instead of a self-existence, he is the mere product of the mind: instead of a creator, he is a creature. In place of external and unchangeable, his existence is only occasional, as the mind generates and reproduces it. It varies perpetually, as the conception varies, and it passes out of being, when it vanishes from the thoughts. It is impossible, therefore, that it should be an object of adoration, trust, and love, as a reality; and if it were, the homage paid it would be paid to a wholly different object from God. No more specific and absolute apostasy from Jehovah can be conceived. To suppose one who holds this theory is a worshipper of him, is as absurd and contradictious, as it were to ascribe that character to the worshippers of Moloch and Dagon. To suppose that they are Christians, is

as reasonless and preposterous, as it were to give that name to Paine, Rousseau, and Voltaire.

Such are they also, who, like Schelling, instead of this idealism, entertain the theory of material or psychical pantheism. They, in fact, differ very little from the school of Kant and Hegel, as they maintain essentially the same theory of perceptions and ideas; and their deity and universe accordingly, are as purely hypothetical or supposititious, as the notional ones are to which idealists ascribe a fancied external reality. Thus, Schelling held, that "Before the time when creation began, we *may imagine* that an infinite mind, an infinite essence, or an infinite thought (for here all these are one), filled the universe of space. This then as the self-existent one, must be the only absolute reality: all else can be but the developing of the one original and eternal being." This infinite something, which he denominates self-existent, and the absolute, is thus as purely conceptional or supposititious, as are the deity and universe of the idealist. He merely imagines its existence; and so vague is his notion of its nature, that it is immaterial to his theory, whether it is regarded as an infinite intelligence, an infinite essence, or only an infinite thought. It is not therefore, and cannot on his theory, be a reality to him; nor on the supposition of its real existence, can it by possibility come within the sphere of his knowledge. It is as absolutely beyond his grasp, and wrapped in as impenetrable darkness, as though it were not an existence. It is impossible, therefore, that it should be an object of adoration and trust as a real and conscious intelligence; or if it were, that worship cannot be the worship of Jehovah. The supposition that it is, or can be, is not only immeasurably false, but blasphemous. No detraction can be greater, than to represent the adoration of such a mere hypothetical being, that is not only unknown and unknowable, but by the definition, absolutely unreal—is the adoration of the self-existent Jehovah, who is both known by his boundless works, and has revealed himself directly to patriarchs and prophets, to the whole Jewish people through his Son, and to multitudes of Gentiles from generation to generation, through his word.

But besides these, there are other features of their theory that make their fancied deity infinitely unlike the Jehovah of the Bible.

Their object in framing this hypothesis of an infinite something denominated the Absolute, that produced the universe out of itself, is simply to be able to account philosophically or logically, for the existence of the finite things of which the phenomenal universe consists. They accordingly hold that all material and psychical finite existences, are but evolutions or unfoldings of that infinite something in those limited forms; that they are all therefore parts of God; that those of them, such as men, that are psychical, are God as an intelligence; and that it is in man alone, that God exists as an intelligence, and has a personality. Their deity, accordingly, so far as he is an intelligent and personal existence, is nothing but man, mankind, or humanity, as it subsists from period to period. It is therefore infinitely unlike Jehovah. Instead of being God, it is a creature or assemblage of creatures. Instead of eternal and unchangeable, it is temporary and successive: instead of boundless, independent, perfect, and holy, it is limited, dependent, weak, necessitous, ignorant, debased, unholy, and wretched. A worship paid to it, therefore, is not a worship of Jehovah. To offer it homage and adoration, is to reject him in the most absolute and impious manner, and substitute a debased and guilty creature in his place. If this is not apostasy from Jehovah, what is? If this is not to change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to worship and serve the creature instead of the creator, what species of revolt, what blasphemous conversion of his truth into a lie, can deserve that name?

This class of pantheists must therefore, like those of the ideal school, be regarded as utter aliens from the religion of the Bible. Neither their God, their faith, nor their worship, has anything in common with the Christian system. They are as devoid of all title to be ranked among the worshippers of Jehovah, the disciples of Christ, as the devotees of Brama and Buddh, or the sottish adorers of the Llama.

II. Of those who directly reject Christ, we shall mention but three classes: those who contemplate him as a mere creature, and hold therefore that his office and work are those of a mere human teacher:—those who, professing to regard him as divine, yet represent him as no more divine than on their pantheistic theory all other human beings are;

and those who substitute some other being or beings in his place. They altogether reject Christ who regard him as a mere creature who has no other office than that of a teacher; for he reveals and proclaims himself in the Scriptures as divine, as the self-existent, the creator, upholder, and ruler of all, and as not only an authoritative teacher, but as the Redeemer of men, who unfolds the way for their redemption from sin and its curse by his death, and who actually bestows, on the ground of his obedience and sacrifice, the blessings of renovation, pardon, and eternal life on all who become partakers of them. To contemplate him therefore as a mere man who has no other function than that of a simple teacher, is to reject him altogether in his relation as a Saviour, in which he is to be received in order to a participation in the blessings of his redemption. Faith in such a mere teacher, is not faith in the Eternal Word incarnate in our nature, crucified for our sins, raised for our justification, and reigning on the throne of the universe for the completion of our redemption. Instead, the rejection of him in these great characters and offices is the very definition of that unbelief which draws after it, by the most indubitable necessity, the sentence to eternal death.

He is rejected also by those who, with Schelling and other pantheists, maintaining that all men are outbirths of the deity, or God in finite forms, teach that Christ is no more divine than any other individual of the race: for their theory implies that he had no consciousness nor personality anterior to his becoming man, and denies therefore that he is the creator of the world, that he is the Messenger Jehovah who revealed himself to the patriarchs and prophets, and was the Mediator from the beginning between the Father and men. They reject him therefore in his true nature and character, and put their trust in a mere conceptional or fictitious Saviour.

Their pantheistic theory leads them also to a wholly false notion of his work. If, as they maintain, men are God in finite forms, it is manifest that Christ must have come to redeem God, not mere creatures wholly distinct from him and unlike him in nature and character. Faith in him therefore in such a relation, must be a wholly different act from faith in him as the Redeemer of men who are creatures

distinct from God, and dissimilar in character, condition, and nature. But if men are God in a human form, and all their acts and affections are his, how can it be supposed that they need a redemption by an expiatory sacrifice, and a justification by grace? How can an individual of such a race of divinities be supposed to ransom the others, or any portion of them, by such a measure? He plainly cannot. This appalling difficulty is felt by these speculatists, and though evaded, has led them in effect to deny that Christ is a redeemer, and to maintain that the object of his death, resurrection, assumption to heaven, and investiture there with supreme power, is simply to indicate and exemplify the nature of the salvation that is to be bestowed on men; or show that they are to be released from the evils with which they are now overwhelmed, and raised to an immortal and blissful life. But that is to deny the real object and effect of his death, and make him, instead of a redeemer, *the subject himself* of a redemption, which they hold, is, irrespective of his death, to be bestowed on others. They place the ground of redemption, therefore, altogether out of his work, and divest faith in him of identically that element which is essential in order to a participation in the salvation he bestows. To believe in him as a Saviour without any reference to his death, or as a Saviour of God instead of creatures, as a subject of redemption, instead of its author and bestower, is not to believe in him at all as Christ crucified, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. It is to deny the Lord that bought them, and substitute in his place a phantom of their own creation, and is therefore an αἵρεσις ἀπωλείας, a heresy that will bring on them swift destruction.

They reject him also who assign his peculiar offices to other beings; such as those who look to the priest to make expiation for their sins, and to the intercessions of angels and saints for the obtainance of the divine favor. They disown him as effectually in those relations, as they would if they did not at all acknowledge him as a Saviour. They build their reliance for salvation as absolutely on others, as they could if they formally rejected him as a sacrifice and intercessor. As in the offering of the mass no expiation is made, any more than in any other senseless

and those who substitute some other being or beings in his place. They altogether reject Christ who regard him as a mere creature who has no other office than that of a teacher; for he reveals and proclaims himself in the Scriptures as divine, as the self-existent, the creator, upholder, and ruler of all, and as not only an authoritative teacher, but as the Redeemer of men, who unfolds the way for their redemption from sin and its curse by his death, and who actually bestows, on the ground of his obedience and sacrifice, the blessings of renovation, pardon, and eternal life on all who become partakers of them. To contemplate him therefore as a mere man who has no other function than that of a simple teacher, is to reject him altogether in his relation as a Saviour, in which he is to be received in order to a participation in the blessings of his redemption. Faith in such a mere teacher, is not faith in the Eternal Word incarnate in our nature, crucified for our sins, raised for our justification, and reigning on the throne of the universe for the completion of our redemption. Instead, the rejection of him in these great characters and offices is the very definition of that unbelief which draws after it, by the most indubitable necessity, the sentence to eternal death.

He is rejected also by those who, with Schelling and other pantheists, maintaining that all men are outbirths of the deity, or God in finite forms, teach that Christ is no more divine than any other individual of the race: for their theory implies that he had no consciousness nor personality anterior to his becoming man, and denies therefore that he is the creator of the world, that he is the Messenger Jehovah who revealed himself to the patriarchs and prophets, and was the Mediator from the beginning between the Father and men. They reject him therefore in his true nature and character, and put their trust in a mere conceptional or fictitious Saviour.

Their pantheistic theory leads them also to a wholly false notion of his work. If, as they maintain, men are God in finite forms, it is manifest that Christ must have come to redeem God, not mere creatures wholly distinct from him and unlike him in nature and character. Faith in him therefore in such a relation, must be a wholly different act from faith in him as the Redeemer of men who are creatures

distinct from God, and dissimilar in character, condition, and nature. But if men are God in a human form, and all their acts and affections are his, how can it be supposed that they need a redemption by an expiatory sacrifice, and a justification by grace? How can an individual of such a race of divinities be supposed to ransom the others, or any portion of them, by such a measure? He plainly cannot. This appalling difficulty is felt by these speculatists, and though evaded, has led them in effect to deny that Christ is a redeemer, and to maintain that the object of his death, resurrection, assumption to heaven, and investiture there with supreme power, is simply to indicate and exemplify the nature of the salvation that is to be bestowed on men; or show that they are to be released from the evils with which they are now overwhelmed, and raised to an immortal and blissful life. But that is to deny the real object and effect of his death, and make him, instead of a redeemer, *the subject himself* of a redemption, which they hold, is, irrespective of his death, to be bestowed on others. They place the ground of redemption, therefore, altogether out of his work, and divest faith in him of identically that element which is essential in order to a participation in the salvation he bestows. To believe in him as a Saviour without any reference to his death, or as a Saviour of God instead of creatures, as a subject of redemption, instead of its author and bestower, is not to believe in him at all as Christ crucified, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world. It is to deny the Lord that bought them, and substitute in his place a phantom of their own creation, and is therefore an *αἵρεσις ἀπωλείας*, a heresy that will bring on them swift destruction.

They reject him also who assign his peculiar offices to other beings; such as those who look to the priest to make expiation for their sins, and to the intercessions of angels and saints for the obtainance of the divine favor. They disown him as effectually in those relations, as they would if they did not at all acknowledge him as a Saviour. They build their reliance for salvation as absolutely on others, as they could if they formally rejected him as a sacrifice and intercessor. As in the offering of the mass no expiation is made, any more than in any other senseless

act, faith in that impious imagination, instead of faitl Christ, is expressly founded on a distrust in his sacrific inadequate, or ineffective to the necessities of the offerer; must necessarily therefore involve him in the most exa bated guilt and condemnation of unbelief; and as no s intercessions as are ascribed to the saints are ever made them, or are possible, faith in them, instead of faith in Ch is founded on a distrust of the efficacy or reality of intercessions, and must necessarily therefore draw on disbeliever in his intercessions, the penalty of the n specific and impious unbelief. They are apostates there from him, and must of necessity by their distrust on the hand, and false faith on the other, bring upon themselves doom he assigns his enemies.

III. There is a far more numerous class whose doctr are false and destructive respecting the character and co tion of mankind, the nature of the salvation God bestc the means through which it is conferred, the authority of Scriptures, and the proper objects and grounds of religi faith. We shall enumerate only some of the most consp ous that prevail at the present time.

1. Such are they, who teach that men stand in no nee a redemption; that they are essentially virtuous and enti to the divine approval; that it were unjust in God to pur them for ever for their faults in this life; and that they n safely rely on his goodness for a happy immortality, with the intervention of a mediator to procure that blessing them by the expiation of their sins, and the renovatio their hearts. As they thus specifically deny their nee redemption, they plainly cannot participate in the salvat which Christ bestows, in order to which faith in him is indispensable condition. In open war with God's gove ment and irreconcilable enemies, their destruction is as i vitable as it would be were there no salvation. To supp it can be otherwise, is to treat the denunciation by the gos of death on the unbelieving as a mockery. "He t despised Moses' law died without mercy. Of how m sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought wor who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath cou ed the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified unholy thing, and hath done despite to the Spirit of grac

2. Such are they also, who, while they hold that a deliverance of the mind from the dominion of evil is necessary, yet maintain that from its nature as a moral agent, it is impossible to God to work that deliverance by the influence of his Spirit, and that if it is turned from rebellion to obedience, it must be by its own unassisted act. They exhibit God as undertaking a redemption through the mediation of Christ, which he is unable to accomplish. They represent man as altogether out of the sphere of his moral jurisdiction; as placed by his very nature beyond the reach of a renovating and saving power from him; and therefore deny the whole ground on which the work of redemption proceeds, and specifically reject the deliverance from the dominion of sin which Christ bestows through the new-creating power of the Spirit, which is the only renovation that is known to men. By that rejection, they preclude themselves, therefore, from his salvation, as absolutely as they would if they denied the fact itself and necessity of a redemption.

3. Such are they also, who deny that Christ's death was expiatory, and who therefore, instead of a Saviour, regard him as a mere teacher. For they reject him in the identical relation in which he is to be received and trusted in order to a participation in his salvation. Instead, therefore, of washing their robes and making them white in his blood, they deny that he has bought them, count his blood an unholy thing, and debar themselves from the blessings it was shed to procure.

4. Such are they who represent the change wrought in the mind by which it becomes a partaker of spiritual life, as wrought by the sacraments or the priest, instead of the divine Spirit. For they wholly misrepresent the process of redemption, ascribe the work of Christ and the Spirit to a wholly different agent, and lead the sinner to place his trust for salvation on altogether a false ground. The sacrament being made the object of faith instead of Christ, he is as really rejected as though he were not acknowledged in any relation as a Saviour.

5. Such are they, likewise, who deny the justification of men by grace through faith in the blood of Christ; and maintain that some act which they exert, or some effect wrought in them by the sacraments, is the ground of their pardon and acceptance; for they reject Christ in the very

idea, as an unconscious and impersonal Absolute, or as existing only as a conscious intelligence in creatures and men, is in their estimate no apostasy from him, and no disqualification for his favor. In like manner, to deny the deity, the expiation, and the intercessions of Christ, and contemplate him as only an idea, or a mere man, is not in their judgment to reject him, nor a disqualification for the blessings of redemption. And so, simply to trust for a salvation, though it be on the mere ground of works, of the elevation of a wafer, of the act of a priest, of the intercession of saints, and wholly irrespective therefore of the merits of Christ, and the renewing influences of the Spirit, is deemed all that is necessary to constitute a true faith, and insure all the blessings that are promised to true believers. But this, instead of the true worshippers, is precisely the character of apostates, who change the truth of God into a lie, who pay their homage to creatures, and build their hopes on them instead of him. To suppose that they are not such, and that their doctrine is not a doctrine of perdition, is in effect to deny that there can be an apostasy; and treat the distinction between truth and error, belief and unbelief, as a senseless fiction, a bodiless shadow.

It will perhaps be said, that although these parties are indeed, in a very important sense, false believers and false teachers, yet they are sincere in their errors, and ought not, therefore, to be regarded as altogether apostates from the Christian faith. We answer first, that it is not necessary that they should reject every part of the Christian system, in order to apostatize from it. It is to apostatize, to deny and reject its great essential truths, and teach a method of salvation that differs from it in principle, or build a hope of acceptance with God on a different ground. Thus Paul exhibits those who taught another method of justification, as preaching another gospel, and denounces on them an anathema, though they should be angels from heaven. Peter represents those as introducing a destructive heresy, who denied the Lord that bought them, and bringing on themselves a quick perdition.

Nor is the fact that they are sincere in the belief and advocacy of their false doctrines, any proof that they are not in alienation from God, and heirs of condemnation. So far from it, their sincerity is a decisive indication that they are

in reality what their errors imply. As they intelligently and sincerely reject the Jehovah of the Scriptures, the Christ of redemption, and the salvation which he proffers, and build their hope of eternal life on another ground, their alienation from God and obnoxiousness to death, is for that very reason indisputable. The certainty of their non-renovation and non-participation in the blessings of redemption, instead of being weakened, is confirmed and made proportional to the strength and sincerity of their unbelief.

Their sincerity in their errors, however, does not necessarily imply that they are always candid and upright in the profession they make in conjunction with them, of belief in the truths of the Christian system, on other subjects. Instead, the probability of their disingenuousness in the one, is just in proportion to the certainty of their sincerity in the other. The false teachers, accordingly, whose character is drawn in the Scriptures, are universally exhibited as hypocrites, who make their Christian profession a means of obtaining worldly and selfish ends. Their procedure is "according to the inworking of Satan, with all lying wonders, and all deceivableness of unrighteousness." They "speak lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron." "They are lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, false accusers, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof."

And that is, very generally, the character, we believe, of the errorists of the present day, whom we have specified, who continue to profess to receive the doctrines generally of the Christian system. Thus, that those who favor the doctrines of Romanism are sincere in their errors, no one needs to doubt; but who, after the deceptions and hypocrisies that have characterized that class for fifteen or twenty years, can now place any trust in protestations that may be made by them, that they still continue in the Protestant faith? As the two are wholly inconsistent, their sincerity in the one is, of necessity, a proof of their hypocrisy in the other. In like manner, those who, twenty years ago, denied the renovation of the mind by the Holy Spirit, and maintained that from the nature of a moral agent, it is impossible to prove that God can prevent him from sinning, were doubtless sincere

There are thousands who profess to reject them as errors, who nevertheless act in respect to them, as though they were of no vital significance, and form no reason that those who teach them should not be recognised as the true ministers of Christ. In fact, some of the most effective co-operators of the apostates of the day, are undoubtedly those who affecting not to have embraced their doctrines, but to adhere to the orthodox faith, still recognise them as true Christian teachers, and discountenance and reproach those who expose their errors, and endeavor to guard the churches against their pernicious influence. For by the sanction they thus give, they enable these deceitful workers to impose on the unsuspecting, by their false professions, and to spread their fatal doctrines without obstruction. That those who thus sanction them can be no sincere friends of the truth, is sufficiently apparent. If they are not, like many of the apologists for the great Romanizing heresiarchs of the day, converts in fact, to the dogmas they pretend to reject, they can have no insuperable objection to them: some personal or party interest has a higher consideration with them than the truth, and they are ready to throw their weight into whichever side of the scale will best subserve their selfish ends. They are in reality, therefore, among the most mischievous enemies of the cause of Christ, and will undoubtedly, in the end, be found as total strangers to him, as the false teachers are to whom they give their sanction. Too timid, too much the creatures of worldly policy, too much the votaries of party and ambition, to lisp a syllable in vindication of the most essential truths of Christianity, when it will cost them a personal sacrifice, were they placed in the condition of the ancient confessors, can any one doubt that they would renounce the Christian name, rather than meet the penalty of fidelity; that they would be found among the offerers of incense to the idol, rather than the witnesses of Jesus at the scaffold and the stake? Yet the obligations to a faithful testimony to the truth are as absolute now, as they were then; and those who now prove recreant to their duty, give as decisive proof that they are not the disciples of Christ, as the faithless did in that age. "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not *in the doctrine of Christ*, hath not God. He that abideth in he doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son.

If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed. For he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." What a change would be wrought in the policy of thousands of the conspicuous and aspiring, were this duty felt? How instantly would the popularity expire of not a few who are now the objects of much admiration and praise, were this great injunction obeyed by those who aim to guide the judgment of the church, and determine who shall enjoy the honors of reputation and influence!

ART. III.—MERCANTILE MORALS; or, Thoughts for Young Men entering Mercantile Life, by WILLIAM HOWARD VAN DOREN, Pastor of the Second Reformed Dutch Church of Piermont, N. Y. New York: Charles Scribner. 1852.

THIS volume on the duties and dangers of young men who are entering on a commercial life, is especially timely, from the great numbers that are now engaging in mercantile pursuits, and the unusual hazard to which they are exposed from the great prosperity that prevails, and the spirit of adventure and speculation which it is generating. There is no one who stands in such need of being reminded of the perpetual obligation of truth and justice as the merchant. His business consists almost entirely in communication with his fellow men, and thence a power and art of influencing and persuading them, is one of his principal means of success. He is consequently, unless eminently wise and upright, under a perpetual temptation to indulge in over-statements, unreasonable persuasions, and deception, to accomplish the purchase or sale of his merchandise on terms that are peculiarly favorable to his interests. It is not so with the agriculturist, the mechanic, or the navigator. They deal mainly with brute matter, which presents no occasion for misrepresentation, and offers no temptation to treachery or fraud. The husbandman has no opportunity for deception in breaking up his grounds, sowing his seed, or gathering his harvests. He cannot cheat the earth, the

rains, or the sunshine. He cannot talk December or March into the belief that its is the proper season for summer temperature, and induce it to raise the thermometer from zero to a dog-day heat. A chance to promote his interest by the arts of deception does not come till, carrying his crops to market, he himself becomes a merchant in disposing of them to the professional trafficker. And so of the artisan, the navigator, and many other classes. It is only in that part of their business in which they buy, hire, or procure the possession of property in some form, or sell or transfer it to others, that they have opportunity and inducements to misrepresent, delude, and defraud.

The merchant is exposed to peculiar dangers also, from the great fluctuations of trade. He is liable in seasons of prosperity to be betrayed into an exorbitant ambition, and imprudent efforts to acquire a fortune at a stroke. The farmer feels the disastrous influence of such periods, but in a slight degree. As the course of nature is essentially the same, and his crops bear ordinarily much the same ratio to the ground he cultivates and the labor he bestows on them, he feels the change of price that takes place from time to time, on so moderate a quantity, that it carries him but little out of the line of his settled expectations, and presents little excitement to his ambition. The possibility of a great and sudden fortune does not come within the sweep of his business.

Young men are assailed by still greater dangers, also, in the principal commercial cities, from the glare of wealth and fashion, from pernicious examples, and from the temptations with which they are beset to intoxicating and corrupting pleasures.

There is no class, therefore, that stands in more eminent need of being impressively reminded on the one hand of the great duties of uprightness, truth, candor, and fidelity; of a hearty fear and love of God; of watchfulness against sin; and of being warned, on the other, of the fatal consequences that infallibly result from dishonesty, exorbitant worldliness, vice, and irreligion.

Such counsels and warnings are given in this work in a series of chapters on mercantile morality, the danger of the young merchant from a desire to become speedily rich, from

pernicious examples, evil company, mischievous books, corrupting amusements, and a variety of other themes, in which the duties of industry, prudence, virtue, and religion are earnestly enforced, and a just picture is drawn of the dishonor and ruin that follow in the train of idleness, profligacy, and crime. Instead of mere didactic statements and general exhortations, the pages are enlivened with a great variety of incidents and narratives, that form a graphic portraiture of life, exemplify the doctrine, and show the certainty with which in the main, even in this world virtue is crowned with gracious rewards, and vice meets an ignominious doom. The author's style and method of treating subjects may be seen from a single passage, on the different feeling with which the sceptic contemplates the judgments on men that are narrated in the Scriptures from similar events that are detailed by uninspired historians.

"No truth in the Bible so arouses the enmity of the sceptic's heart as that of the divine sovereignty. Let us compare two acts of the sovereignty of God: one described by Moses, and the other by Pliny. In the year 70, Pliny witnessed the destruction of the populous and splendid city Pompeii. Herculaneum perished at the same time. These opulent and powerful cities had stood one thousand four hundred years. Their overthrow was as clearly an act of sovereignty as that of Sodom and the cities of the plain. The little innocents, that knew not their right hand from their left, perished by thousands, as terribly under the lava of Vesuvius, as those of Sodom under the storm of fire from the Lord. Pliny's account, though brief, is confirmed by all the publications concerning these exhumed ruins. Moses's account, equally brief, is confirmed by all the travellers who have ever visited the Dead Sea. But Moses's authenticity is reduced to a *myth* or a fable, and Pliny, the philosopher, is credited. Why is this? Simply because Pliny was a heathen, and describes a phenomenon of nature that can be explained by natural causes. He knew not God, neither did he eye his hand in the awful ruin. But Moses's record binds together *Sodom's sin with Sodom's doom*. Ere the earthquake had upheaved the mighty palaces, or her streets, and parks, and temples, were ploughed by the living thunderbolts, Divine Sovereignty informed the church that the guilt of those cities was such that in justice they were about to be wiped out from the face of the earth.

"On the contrary, Pliny never intimates that any messenger

heralded the downfall of the Italian cities. The crater of the vol cano opened her mouth, and poured such ruin over those cities tha scarcely a Lot escaped to tell of the catastrophe. Had the record of Seneca and Pliny all perished, yet in these ruins, this very hou we find evidences of guilt and abomination that leave behind a that we have ever read or conceived of Sodom..... Pliny speak with truth, and must be believed; Moses hints at the sovereignty, an must be rejected. He proves that God has a right to kindle a fi on earth. If so, it follows that he has the same right to kindle on in perdition. The sceptic feels that if the dwellers in the plain coul be punished here, he may be punished *there*. It makes a wide di ference whether he rejects Paul or Polybius, Moses or Pliny. H therefore, opposes the Bible, because it opposes his security.

"Lisbon, Lima, and Port Royal were overthrown by earth quakes during the last two hundred years. Can the sceptic believ the eye-witnesses whose testimonies would fill a volume? Can h believe that innocent childhood and trembling age, lisping infanc and maturer years, the pastor and the flock, the kneeling worshi per, and the hoary pirate in chains, all, without warning, perishe instantaneously? Yes, he can ascribe all this to the mighty revu sions of nature, to the expansion of gases in the central depths the earth, to the will of God. On the contrary, when the Bib tells him of a commission Joshua the leader of the church had exterminate by fire and sword the people living in Canaan; whe the sceptic reads that the authority of a merciful God was affirme to be the cause of all this, he cries out, *Circumcised butchery!* not consistency a jewel? If his heart deceive not the young scepti then where is there delusion on earth? If he can see God's han doing the same thing yesterday by the *sword*, to-day by an *earth quake*, why not acknowledge the same sovereignty in both? No he will not. I say he *dare not!* To admit it would be condemn ing himself. He can see the same hand destroying the thousan and tens of thousands in Lima, Lisbon, and Port Royal, and yet, l himself being judge, God was just; and should he again see fit destroy the capitals of Portugal, Peru, and Jamaica, he would altogether right. But if any human instrumentality is selected l the same sovereignty to destroy the Amorites and Hivites, who abominations, to use the emphatic language of the Holy Ghost, h made the land *sick*, and cast forth its polluted population, as t system expels poison, then it is cruelty. It cannot be thus a God love acts! No; the record is a slander on Jehovah. He cann he will not believe it! Hence he rejects the Bible. But the scept has his reasons for thus acting. If the Creator has a right to puni

nations for sin, he has a right to punish *individuals*. This doctrine, if admitted, enfolds his soul in its iron network, and he liberates himself by boldly denying its truth. Conscience is soothed, and he can sin on at pleasure."—Pp. 312–317.

He presents as a dissuasive from commercial life, the frequent and fatal disasters to which it is subject. He falls into the error, however, in reference to those which swept over the country fifteen or sixteen years ago, of assigning them in far too great a degree to prodigality and neglect of business. He says:

"There are some curious statistics collected from the Directory of one of our eastern cities, from which we collect this strange but melancholy fact. Counting the number of firms in 1838 found under a given letter, and then counting those surviving in 1846, deducting for deaths and retirement, there were left *two hundred and fifty firms which must have become bankrupt in the short space of eight years*. This must be confessed to be sad encouragement for young men casting in their chance in the great metropolis lottery of merchandise. Yet, we believe, prodigality and inattention to business were the cause of nine tenths of these failures."—P. 133.

We know nothing of these cases particularly, but doubt not that they were the consequence, as the failures of that period almost without exception were, of the war of the national government on the currency and commerce of the country, which in 1837 caused the suspension of the banks and a large proportion of the merchants, and by the diminution of the currency and depreciation of every description of property, reduced many thousands of the latter ere they could liquidate their affairs—which occupied two or three years—from wealth to bankruptcy. That it was generally not the consequence of prodigality, inattention, imprudence, or any other fault of the merchants, is apparent from the fact, that the misfortune overwhelmed alike all classes; the most economical, prudent, and industrious, as well as the idle, the rash, and the prodigal; the strong as well as the weak; the rich as well as those of moderate means. Prudence, activity, economy could not save men, when by the violent and lawless acts of the government, the currency was instantaneously struck from existence, the prices of property of the

best descriptions reduced on an average fifty per cent., and the value of many kinds absolutely annihilated. There were thousands, indeed, and tens of thousands of wealthy persons, not at all engaged in commercial pursuits, who were utterly ruined by the destruction of the institutions in which their property was invested. The sums blotted out of being in the State of Pennsylvania alone in that manner, amounted probably to not less than one hundred millions of dollars; and in the country, at large, to four or five times that sum. The stock of the State of Ohio, considered as among the safest in the Union, sank seventy per cent., and the stock of New York about fifty per cent. There was as great a fall generally in the best class of bank stocks, and in many instances even greater. Real estate fell in the principal cities on an average not less than one half; while there were hundreds of millions of merchandise on which the owners lost from one fourth to one half the cost. In the mean time, the power of earning was diminished in an equal proportion, and crowds reduced to ruin by that cause; multitudes who lived by their labor were thrown out of employment, and obliged to spend the little sums they had saved by their former industry, or run in debt, to supply the wants of their families; while those who continued to find occupation obtained but two thirds or three quarters of their former wages. The loss to the population at large, merchants, agriculturists, mechanics, and others, by the reduced value of labor, or diminished power of earning, was immense, and exceeded, we doubt not, many times in the five years from January, 1837, to January, 1842, the aggregate of the balances that remained unpaid by all the merchants who suffered bankruptcy during that period. Let us suppose that there were in the various occupations 8,000,000 of persons whose wages, or power of earning in their own business, was diminished on an average a shilling a day, and it would amount to a million of dollars a day, to six millions a week, and to more than three hundreds of millions a year. Had the government, leaving the currency untouched, and the people to their former natural power of earning, imposed such a tax on their labor, for even a single year, it would have been regarded as a stupendous oppression, and would have met a general resistance. It would in fact, however,

have been of no moment had it even been continued through the five years from 1836 to 1842, compared with the annihilation of property in various forms, to which the country was subjected during that period. We have seen estimates, the accuracy of which could not be reasonably disputed, that the injuries inflicted on the national wealth and industry by that war of the government on the people, far exceeded the public debt of Great Britain. The ruin of the vast crowds who became bankrupt during that period, was not the consequence, then, in any noticeable measure of their prodigality, inattention to business, or want of skill and prudence. They were struck down by the resistless power of the government, wielded at the time by a cabal of unscrupulous men, who, in violation of law, aimed at a control of the national and state banks, as a means of augmenting their political power, and were reckless and wicked enough to attempt to build their personal aggrandizement on the ruin of their constituents.

Though, however, the catastrophe arose from a cause so different from those to which our author refers it, it exemplifies in a very impressive manner, the reverses of which he adduces it as an instance, to which merchants especially are subject. It deserves to be noticed indeed, that the principal revulsions that have taken place in our commerce during the last fifty years, have been the result of the action of the government; as those of 1809 and 1810, which were produced by the embargo and non-intercourse; those of 1812 to 1817, which sprang from the war with Great Britain; that of 1833, which was produced by the removal of the deposits; that of 1837 to 1842, which was caused by the breaking up of the national and state banks; and that of 1845, which was occasioned by the war with Mexico.

Disastrous changes, however, sometimes take place from other causes; as from famine, pestilence, wars between other commercial nations, that disturb the distribution, and lessen the consumption of merchandise, and not unfrequently from overtrading and exorbitant speculation.

What the issue is to be, of the present extraordinary expansion of trade, or when the eclaircissement is to come, it is not easy to see. That those who flatter themselves that the days of misfortune are for ever past, that they are here-

after to enjoy uninterrupted success, are to be disappointed, there can be no doubt: and that the tide of disaster, when it sets in, may rush as impetuously, and bear its victims as far back, as the prosperous flood that is now prevailing has carried them forward, is not improbable. Notwithstanding the vast augmentation of capital, the credit both of the monied corporations and of individuals, is carried to such an extreme, that apparently, a slight shock would be sufficient to plunge them into inextricable embarrassment, and crush the hopes of multitudes who now rank among the prospering and the rich.

Nor can it yet be seen, what the final effects are to be, that are to spring from the vast accessions that are now making to the precious metals. One of the most conspicuous of the moral effects to which they have hitherto given birth, is a vast and frightful development of a spirit of worldliness; an eager desire of wealth, and a readiness to sacrifice health and life to attain it. Another mischievous effect has been, a rapid increase of luxury, extravagance, and corrupting pleasures. Its principal influence thus far, has been to rouse the passions of men to a higher energy, and give them a wider play, and thus prepare them, by the bolder forms in which they are displaying their characters, for the judgments to which they are advancing. Another important office it may be destined to fill, is perhaps the supply of means for the great contests in which the commercial nations are, ere long, to be involved. The want of credit has for a long period been one of the principal obstacles to a renewal of war in Europe. The vast accumulation of capital that is now taking place, and seeking productive investment, may remove that bar to the ambition of princes, and prompt them to plunge into strifes from which they would otherwise be compelled to abstain.

Art. IV.—Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews, by E. C. Wines.

BY THE REV. ENOCH POND, D.D.

The subject of this volume is one of great importance to all who love the Bible, and the human race. It is the more interesting, because so seldom, and so inadequately treated, more especially by scholars of our own country. With Mr. Wines, it is not a new subject. It has been before his mind for years; he has had access to the best sources of information; and the result of his inquiries, in part, he has presented in the volume before us. We say, *in part;* for the discussion, thus far, is confined to the political *constitution* of the Hebrews. Their *jurisprudence*, properly so called, *i.e.* a classification and particular consideration of the several Mosaic enactments, he does not here enter upon at all. This is reserved for another volume, which we earnestly hope the author may be encouraged to give to the public at no distant day.

The volume before us consists of an Introductory Essay on Civil Society and Government, and two books; the first consisting of preliminary topics, such as the life and character of Moses, his credibility as a historian, his Divine legation, and the influence of his writings on the subsequent civilization of the world; the second treating, under various heads, and in several chapters, of the organic law and constitution of the Hebrew state. The entire plan of the author embraces four additional books; the first, on the rights and duties of *persons* among the Hebrews; the second, on their regulations respecting *property;* the third, on their *criminal* jurisprudence; and the fourth will treat of their *sumptuary and sanitary laws*, and such other regulations as do not fall under either of the preceding divisions. These four books are reserved for the forthcoming volume.

The most elaborately wrought portion of the present volume, that which deserves the *most* of hard study, though we fear it will receive the least, is the Introductory Essay on Civil Society and Government. Mr. W. commences, with showing that civil government is of *Divine* origin and au-

thority. It is not a device of man, but an institution of God. This is proved from the very *nature* of man,—that nature or constitution which God has given him,—which is such as *adapts* him to civil government, and renders it necessary; also from express declarations of Scripture. "The powers that be, are *ordained of God.* Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth *the ordinance of God.*"—Rom. xiii. 1, 2.

But how much is intended by this phraseology? Not that God has appointed any particular *form* of civil government, to the exclusion of all others; nor that he proceeds in this matter, as in his physical laws, without the instrumentality of men; nor that he ordinarily designates any particular individuals to be his instruments in governing the rest. But, when civil government has been appropriately established under any form, and has gone into operation, and is promoting the objects for which it exists, it is to be regarded as having the sanction of heaven; it is a Divine institution; and he who resists it, resists the ordinance of God.

It follows from this account of the matter, that while civil government is, in the highest sense, of *Divine* origin and authority, it also has a *human* origin. While it is primarily of God, it is in a lower sense of man. Men are God's instruments in establishing it, administering it, and bringing out its results; and in all this they act, not mechanically, but deliberately and freely. The question, then, is appropriate and important: What is the rightful origin of civil government, so far as *men* are concerned in it? Is it the right of the stronger over the weaker? The right of compulsion, of conquest, of physical force? This is *all* the right, which, in many, perhaps in most instances of human government, can in truth be claimed. Still, is it the proper, the just right? Or does this arise rather from the *consent* of the governed,—a consent, either expressly or impliedly, openly or tacitly given? The latter, surely, is the appropriate origin of civil government, so far as men have aught to do with it; and this involves all that Mr. W. has said, and for the saying of which he has been censured in certain quarters, as in favor of what is called the *social compact.* He does not detract aught from the *Divine* authority of civil government; but so far as *men* are concerned in it (and from the nature of the case they must be concerned), and so far as its origin is

rightful and legitimate, it must grow out of the consent of the governed.

Mr. W. proceeds to show, that such was the origin of even the theocratic government of the Hebrews. This form of government implied something more than that God was the absolute and sovereign ruler of the Hebrews, as he is of all the nations and inhabitants of the earth, but that he was their *civil Ruler*, their *Monarch*, their *political Head;* and he would not assume such an attitude and relation towards them, without their consent. Accordingly, in the third month after the departure of the Israelites from Egypt, and on the very day of their encampment at the foot of Sinai, Moses receives a summons to appear before God on the mount; and there he is instructed *to propose Jehovah to the people as their Civil Ruler and Head.* Coming down from the mount, he assembles the elders of Israel, and in due form submits to them the proposition. They give it their formal assent; whereupon Moses re-ascends the mount, and returns the words of the people to Jehovah. The compact between them being thus formed, Jehovah proceeds to say, "Lo I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, and may believe thee for ever." See Ex. xix. The third day after this, the ten commandments were given, amid the most terrific displays of the Divine majesty and power; and these were immediately followed by the various other enactments of the Hebrew law.

Having thus proved that even the theocracy of the Hebrews was not established without the consent of the people, Mr. Wines proceeds to show, that the same was true of several other ancient governments, as it is of the more liberal and enlightened governments of modern times. One of the most striking instances of the social compact, or of a government formed by the consent of the governed, occurred on board the May Flower, Nov. 11, 1620, only a few days before the landing of the Pilgrims on Plymouth Rock. Their example has been followed by all the states of the American Union, and also by the United States. Our fathers successfully resisted every attempt to impose a yoke upon them against their will, resolved to be governed by laws of their own enacting, and by rulers of their own choice.

Having established the principle, that the only proper

source of civil government, so far as men are concerned with it, is the consent of the governed, Mr. W. proceeds to answer objections; such as, that this doctrine is anti-christian; that it is inconsistent with the idea of an organic unity in the state; that it is unjust and oppressive to minorities; that it makes the relation between rulers and ruled, a commercial one; that it encourages revolution; and that it destroys the right of capital punishment. It is shown that these objections proceed, every one of them, on a false assumption, viz. that the advocates of the social compact, or of mutual consent, exclude the Divine origin and authority of civil government altogether, making it a mere human, conventional affair. Whereas, no people ever insisted more strenuously than our New England fathers, that the civil magistracy, when duly constituted, is to be regarded as the minister of God, and as armed with authority and powers which God only possesses, and which, of course, God only can bestow. The Divine and the human origin of civil government, though very distinct, are perfectly consistent, the one with the other; and both must be firmly held, by all who would conceive of the matter aright. This is the view which the *Scriptures* give us of the subject. Civil government is there called, in one passage, "the ordinance of *God*," and in another, the "ordinance of *man*." Compare Rom. ii. 13, with 1 Pet. ii. 13.

From the "Introductory Essay," which has detained us longer than we had intended, we pass to a consideration of Mr. Wines's first book. This, as before remarked, is occupied with the discussion of preliminary topics; but topics in themselves of great importance, and intimately connected with the subject in hand. The character of Moses, as a man and a lawgiver; the uncertainty of ancient profane history, from which most of the objections to the Pentateuch have been drawn; the authenticity of the several books of Moses; their credibility and Divine authority; we know not where to look for a more satisfactory discussion and vindication of these several points, than is contained in the chapters before us. Mr. W. goes into a consideration of the miracles of Moses, and shows, not only that they were most terrific displays of Almighty power, attesting, beyond all controversy, the divine mission of him, at whose word they were per-

formed, but that they were aimed directly and designedly at the idolatries of Egypt, with a view to bring them into contempt. For example, as the Egyptians were worshippers of the Nile, the God of Israel smote it, and turned its waters into blood. As they worshipped brute beasts, and more especially cattle, God sent a grievous murrain upon their cattle, so that "all the cattle of Egypt died." He had previously afflicted these brute objects of worship, by sending upon them swarms of tormenting flies, from which neither magician nor priest was able to deliver them. The plague of lice had also the same object. The Egyptian priest was required to shave every part of his body once in three days, to prevent lice, or any other species of impurity, from adhering to him. When, therefore, the whole dust of Egypt was turned into lice, swarming everywhere upon priest and people, the worship of their divinities was entirely suspended, and the magicians were constrained to confess, "This is the finger of God."

Mr. Wines has a long chapter on "the influence of the laws and writings of Moses, on the subsequent civilization of the world." Without doubt, this influence has been great; and yet we incline to the opinion that some of the early Christian fathers assumed too much on this subject, and by their confident assertions, have imposed upon others. It was a favorite object with them, or those of them who made pretensions to philosophy, to represent the Grecian sages as having derived nearly all their wisdom from the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus styles Plato, "the Hebrew philosopher," and asserts that "the Greeks stole their best opinions out of Moses and the prophets." Justin Martyr also says: "Plato drew many things from the Hebrew fountains, especially his pious conceptions of God and his worship." That Plato derived no assistance whatever from the Jewish writings, is more than we should be willing to affirm; and yet we are satisfied that the amount of his indebtedness has been vastly overrated. The Jews had not settled in Greece, in the time of Plato; and the few who resided in Egypt were not of sufficient consequence to attract the notice of the philosopher. The era of Hebrew learning in Egypt was a century later. Besides, let any one read attentively the works of Plato,—not the glosses

which the new Platonists put upon his works, but his real writings, as he left them,—and if he can find any quotation from the Old Testament, or any reference to it, or any decisive evidence that Plato had ever seen it, or heard of it, his search will be more successful than ours. The proof is vastly stronger, that the Alexandrian church fathers had been corrupted by the study of Plato, than that Plato had ever been benefited by the study of the Hebrew Scriptures.

We pass from the first book of preliminary topics, to the second, which treats directly of the Hebrew constitution, or the "organic law of the Hebrew state." Among the vital elements or principles which lay at the foundation of the Hebrew state, our author sums up the following: "The unity of God; the unity of the nation; civil liberty; political equality; an elective magistracy; the sovereignty of the people; the responsibility of public officers to their constituents; a prompt, cheap, and impartial administration of justice; peace and friendship with other nations; agriculture; universal industry; the inviolability of private property; the sacredness of the family relation; the sanctity of human life; universal education; social union; a well adjusted balance of powers; together with an enlightened, dignified, and venerable public opinion." And having enumerated these, our author asks: "What better basis of civil polity, what nobler maxims of political wisdom, does the nineteenth century offer to our contemplation, despite its boast of social progress and reform?"

We have said before, that by the free consent of the people, Jehovah was constituted the civil head of the Hebrew state. The law-making power, the sovereignty of the nation, were vested in him. Hence, the Hebrew government was with propriety denominated, by Josephus and others, *a theocracy*. The leading object of this singular arrangement seems to have been two-fold; first, to teach mankind the true science of human government; and, secondly, the overthrow and extirpation of idolatry. In furthering this latter purpose, it was the aim of the lawgiver to effect an entire separation between the Israelites and their idolatrous neighbors, and in this we see a reason,—a good and sufficient reason,—for some of the peculiar enactments of the Hebrews. Thus the law, "Ye shall not round the corners of your heads, neither

shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard,"—a law which has called forth many a sneer from men, who, without any particular claim to such a distinction, arrogate to themselves the exclusive title of free-thinkers,—was aimed against an idolatrous custom which extensively prevailed, at the time when the law was given. The same is true of the prohibition, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk." The ancient heathens were accustomed, when they had gathered in their fruits, to take a kid, and boil it in its mother's milk, and then with the broth, to sprinkle their trees, fields, gardens, and orchards, thinking thereby to make them fruitful; Jehovah would have no such wicked custom practised in Israel. Maimonides informs us, that in very ancient times, the idolatrous priests were required to clothe themselves in garments of linen and woollen mixed together, in performing their religious rites. A divine virtue was attributable to this mixture. Hence, Jehovah forbade the wearing of garments wrought in this way. The same reason may be assigned for the commands not to sow mixed seeds together in the same field, and not to yoke the ox and the ass together in the same team. These laws, and others of a like nature, which infidelity has dared to reproach and ridicule, did the divine wisdom enact, in order to extirpate idolatry, and establish the fundamental truths of the existence and unity of the living God. The design of them was, to keep the Israelites from walking in the ordinances and manners of the nations, which, if permitted, would certainly have led them into sin.

Before proceeding to describe the Hebrew constitution, as established by Moses, it may be necessary to inquire concerning the polity of this people prior to his time. The ancient Hebrew government, like that of most of the surrounding tribes, was patriarchal. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, governed their households with an authority well nigh unlimited. They acknowledged no subjection, and owed no allegiance, to any higher power. The twelve sons of Jacob ruled their respective families in the same way. But when their descendants had become sufficiently numerous to form tribes, each tribe had a prince or ruler of its own, sometimes called "the head of the house of his father." See Numb. i. 4–16. And when the tribes increased to such

an extent as to embrace a great number of separate households, they were divided into families or clans; each of which was subject to a head or chief; these subordinate chiefs, together with those at the head of the tribes, were collectively denominated "the elders of Israel." In addition to these elders, there was another class of men, a learned class, whose duty it was to act as readers and scribes, and to keep the genealogies of the people. These are called "officers," in Exodus v. They were concerned with the taskmasters, in exacting the tale of bricks from the oppressed Israelites. Whether these several offices were hereditary or elective, does not certainly appear; but that such were *the rulers* of the Israelites, under Pharaoh, during their abode in Egypt, there can be no doubt. See Ex. iii. 16–18.

This simple, patriarchal polity, which had long been established in Israel, Moses suffered to remain unaltered. There were still the princes of the tribes, and the chiefs of families, collectively denominated *the elders*. Of the former class, there were twelve; of the latter, fifty-eight; which together, constituted "the seventy elders of Israel." See Ex. xxiv. 1. These were the representatives and magistrates of the people, who led forth their respective tribes in war, and guided their counsels in time of peace.

Shortly after the exile of the people from Egypt, a new class of officers was instituted among them, viz. *the judges*. This was done at the instance of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, an account of which is given in the following verses: "Provide you, out of all the people, able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness, and place such over them, to be rulers of thousands, and rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens; and let them judge the people at all seasons; and it shall be, that every great matter they shall bring unto thee, but every small matter they shall judge. So Moses hearkened to the voice of his father-in-law, and did all that he had said." Ex. xviii. 21–24. These judges, great and small, constituted a numerous body. They were distributed through all the villages and tribes of Israel, and brought the speedy administration of justice to every man's door.

The magistrates, then, in the various cities and tribes of Israel, were the princes of the tribes, the chiefs of families

or clans, the genealogists or scribes, and the judges. When those belonging to any particular tribe were brought together, they constituted the supreme court or legislative assembly of that tribe; and when the magistrates of all the tribes came together, they formed the general court or congress of the nation. These offices were many of them (and perhaps all) elective, and though there was no pecuniary emolument attached to them, they conferred great dignity and authority on those who held them.

It is admitted by all who have studied the Hebrew institutes, that each tribe formed *a separate state*. Each was under its own proper government, administered its own affairs, and exercised most of the rights of sovereignty, such as levying war, and making peace. They did this, not only when there was no king or governor in the land, but even under the government of the kings. Thus in the time of Saul, the tribes which dwelt on the east of the Jordan waged war against the Hagarites and others, overcame them, took their spoil, and dwelt in their cities. See 1 Chron. v. 19–22.

But notwithstanding the powers possessed by the several tribes, they all constituted but *one nation*. They had a common ancestry, the depository of promises, pertaining alike to all the tribes; a common God, who was their chosen and covenanted king; a common tabernacle and temple, which was the royal palace; a common oracle, the urim and thummim; a common high-priest, the prime minister of their king; a common learned class (the Levites), who possessed cities in all the tribes; a common faith and worship, differing essentially from those of all other nations; and a common law of church and state. Thus, while each Hebrew was strongly concerned to maintain the honor of his tribe, the constitution of the general government gave him an equal interest in the honor of his nation. Any one of the tribes could be called to an account by the others, for an infraction of the national customs or laws, and if satisfaction was not rendered, it was liable to be punished by the sword. This was terribly illustrated in the case of the Benjamites, who dared, on a certain occasion, to resist the general government, when its forces were brought to bear down upon them almost to their utter extinction.

It thus appears from this account, that the Hebrew tribes

were, in some respects, independent sovereignties; while in other respects, their individual sovereignty was merged in the broader and higher sovereignty of "the commonwealth of Israel." They were independent republics, having each a local government, which was sovereign in the exercise of its reserved rights; yet they all united together, and formed one great republic, with a general government, which was sovereign in the highest sense. The constitution of Israel had, in this respect, a resemblance to our own, which will strike every reader. It is not unlikely that our fathers got the idea of a great confederated republic from this source. The constitution of Switzerland is also of the same class, where thirteen cantons, each of which has a government of its own, and exercises the right of war and peace, are nevertheless united in one confederacy, under a general government.

The supreme authority of the Hebrew state, as before remarked, was in Jehovah. He was properly the King of Israel. And his authority continued during, not only the administration of the Judges, but that also of the Kings. They reigned by a commission from him, and should be considered as little more than his viceroys.

The rule of the Judges extended from Moses to Samuel. This office was not hereditary, but for the most part elective. The oracle, in some instances, proposed the judge, but the concurrence of the people was necessary in order to the regular exercise of his powers. Thus Jephtha was chosen to the chief-magistracy by the voice of the people, and Samuel was called to the same office in the same way. The rule of the judge continued, ordinarily, during life, and a contumacious resistance of his authority was punishable with death. Thus it is written, "The man that will do presumptuously, and not hearken unto the voice of the judge, even that man shall die."—Deut. xvii. 12. Still, there were many limitations upon the power of the judges, and in general they seem to have exercised their powers in a mild and reasonable way. It may be doubted whether the Israelites were ever more free and happy, than when they were under the control of the judges; and hence their desire of a king was regarded as uncalled for by Samuel and by God.

The kings of Israel, like the judges, were originally elect-

ed. Both Saul and David were anointed of God; but neither of them entered on the administration of government until called to it by the people. And after the reign of the kings had become established, they were not regarded as above the law, but subject to the law. The king was required to keep before him constantly a copy of the law, and to "read therein all the days of his life, that he might learn to fear the Lord his God, and to keep all the words of his law to do them."—Deut. xvii. 14–20.

It thus appears that the kings of Israel were not absolute but limited sovereigns. They were *constitutional* monarchs. They were to observe the compact into which they had entered with God and the people, else (as in the case of Saul) their thrones were to be taken from them, and given to others. The revenue of the kings was derived from several sources, such as presents, tithes, royal demesnes, the spoils of vanquished enemies, the tribute of conquered nations, and after a time a lucrative foreign commerce. Solomon engaged largely in commercial pursuits. He had horses, and chariots, and linen yarn, brought out of Egypt. He had also a navy coming "once in three years, bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks."—1 Kings x.

The Hebrew senate consisted, as we have before seen, of seventy members—heads of the tribes, and chiefs of the houses of their fathers. This venerable body existed even in Egypt. When Moses delivered his first message from God, "he gathered together all *the elders* of the children of Israel, and spake unto them."—Ex. iv. 29. It was *the elders* who assisted Moses in marshalling the host, and leading them in due order, according to their tribes and families, out of Egypt. This body received a more formal organization, with new gifts and powers, in the wilderness of Paran. See Numb. xi. 16, 17. It continued as the Sanhedrim, or grand council of the Jews, down to the period of their final dispersion.

Besides the chief magistrate and the senate, there was a larger and more popular assembly in Israel, commonly called "the congregation." It seems to have been a general gathering of the people, or of such of them as could be called together on important occasions, and for the decision of questions of great national interest. In modern phrase, it

might be called a *convention*. Thus, before the war was entered upon against the Benjamites, the whole congregation of Israel gave their decision in support of the measure.—Judg. xx. 1–11. David also consulted the whole congregation before deciding to bring up the ark from the house of Abinadab to the place which he had prepared for it.—Numb. xiii. 1–4.

Important parts of the Hebrew constitution—important as checks and guides in connexion with the other parts—were the *oracle*, the *priesthood*, and the succession of *inspired prophets and teachers*. By these, the *Divine* element in this wonderful organization caused its power and influence to be continually felt. The *oracle* was no other than the immediate voice of God. It spoke out audibly and terribly from the top of Sinai. It spoke from the Shekinah, which glittered over the mercy-seat. It spoke also from the urim and thummim, which sparkled on the breast-plate of the high-priest. Its utterances were always decisive. To resist them was to resist directly the authority of God.

Another mode in which God caused his voice to be heard in Israel was by the lips of his inspired prophets. These were the teachers and guides of the people—to reprove their wanderings, to encourage them in duty, to disclose occasionally the contingent future, to dispense the threatenings and the promises of heaven. Their authority in Israel was very great. In the first instance, they seem to have been supernaturally called to their work, and qualified for it; but in after time, there were "schools of the prophets," in which young men were trained up to be teachers, and from which those who were to become literal *prophets* were more commonly taken.

Still another class in Israel, who had great influence both in church and state, were the priests. These were confined originally to the descendants of Aaron. Their business was at the tabernacle and temple—to preside at the great festivals, to offer gifts and sacrifices, and to make intercession for the people. In all this they were assisted by their brethren, the Levites; the whole tribe of whom had been consecrated by God for the performance of sacred duties. It devolved on the Levites, not only to assist in the temple worship, but to teach and interpret the laws; to inspire the

people with a sacred regard for their laws; to resist all attempts to overthrow them; and, as they were distributed through every city and tribe, to exert their whole influence to unite the people in the service of God, and bind them together as one body.

No one can look into the Hebrew constitution, as drawn out by Mr. Wines (the main features of which have here been given), without being impressed with the *free* and *liberal* spirit which pervades it all. It as well secured the great objects of government—the supremacy of law on the one hand, and the personal liberty and rights of the citizen on the other—as perhaps any government that ever existed. It was the great exemplar of a free and popular government, from which most other existing governments, having any just claim to freedom, have largely copied. It may well be said of the Hebrew constitution—what Blackstone says of the English—that "every branch of it supports and is supported, regulates and is regulated by, the rest." The congregation, the senate, the chief magistrate, the oracle, the prophet, and the priesthood, constituted so many checks upon each other's power, and all combined their forces to give to the wheels of government a safe direction, and move them in the line of the public liberty and happiness.

We conclude with commending the study of this wonderful constitution to Christians in general, whatever may be their profession or occupation in life. The *antiquarian* should study it for its great antiquity. No other body of laws can at all compare with it in this respect. The Dracos, the Solons, the Lycurguses of Greece were long ages posterior to the Jewish lawgiver, and yet this most venerable code has come down to us entire. It is not fragmentary, and obscured by fable, but has all the completeness and clearness with which it came from the hands of its author. It has survived the ravages of time, and remains a precious relic of the most ancient legislative wisdom.

The *theologian* should study the laws of Moses, that he may learn their divinity, and gather from them religious truth. The great, primary truth of all theology, viz. the self-existence, eternity, unity, and perfections of Jehovah, the sole creator of heaven and earth, shines out conspicuously through them all, and not only so, the law of Moses reveals,

in type and shadow, the whole mystery of redemption by Christ. It led on to the introduction and universal diffusion of that more spiritual religion which is set before us in the gospel.

The *moralist* will find the Mosaic code rich in the principles and maxims of the profoundest ethical wisdom. Where, in the whole compass of human literature, shall we find a summary of moral duty to be compared with that in the decalogue? A supreme love to God, an important love to all our fellow-beings, reverence for old age, the forgiveness of injuries, the rendering good for evil, mutual kindness, compassion towards the unfortunate, a spiritual worship, a generous hospitality—these are some of the duties which the law of Moses enjoins. We shall scarcely find a more vivid presentation of them in the gospel itself.

A knowledge of the Hebrew constitution will also be of essential service to the *lawyer*, the *statesman*, the *legislator*. It contains, undeniably, the germ of almost everything precious in our modern civilization. It is a common fountain, from which the most enlightened nations of subsequent ages have drawn their best principles of political, civil, and criminal law. It embodies and applies, with an admirable skill and efficiency, most of the great principles of just, wise, and equal government. Every motive which can prompt to the study of Grecian or Roman law, will, with at least an equal force, direct to the study of the laws of Moses.

We repeat then, let Christians generally, whatever may be their profession or occupation in life, come back to the study of the Hebrew constitution. It is contained in our Bible, and holds an important position there. It is a part of that Scripture which "was given by inspiration of God, and which is profitable," in *every part* of it, "for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work."

Art. V.—The Presbyterian Quarterly Review on Millenarianism.

BY THE EDITOR.

The articles in the Presbyterian Quarterly on recent expositors of the Apocalypse and on Millenarianism are written in so pert and dogmatical a style, and betray so gross a misunderstanding of the subjects of which they treat, that we doubt not our readers, who have happened to see them, regard them as scarcely worthy of notice. That such indeed is the general judgment respecting them, we have reason to infer from the intimations we have received from several quarters; and among them from some who are of the denomination to which the reviewer himself belongs. But though he has no merits on the score of learning, logic, or taste, and might safely be left to the verdict which good sense and candor will naturally pronounce on him, his discussions have still a measure of interest from the grounds on which he places his attack on us, from the novel principles of interpretation which he advances, from the deceptions which he practises on his readers, and finally from the indications he reveals at every step, that the objections urged by us and others against the views held generally by his party, are felt to be unanswerable, and that it is seen that some modification is essential, both of the system held by antimillenarians, and of the principles on which they attempt to sustain it: and it is for the purpose of pointing out these that we notice it. He deserves indeed some commendation, notwithstanding much disingenuousness, for the candor, compared with others who have assailed us, with which he admits the peculiarity of the views of interpretation on which we proceed, and of the doctrines we maintain. Some allowance moreover must be made for the flippant and oracular tone, especially of his first article, from the extraordinary excitement occasioned by his exaltation to the post of editor and reviewer. The promotion appears to have been too great for one of his temperament. It, for the moment, rendered him dizzy; and in his bewilderment, he seems to have imagined that his dimensions and authority had expanded in proportion to the elevation he had undergone,

and that he had thenceforth only to talk large, dogmatize, and swagger, to command the implicit assent of his readers to whatever he thought proper to assert. Like the boy who, on his admission to school, said in explanation of his having his book wrong end up, that he had not yet got the hang of the school-house; this gentleman seems, at first, not to have got the true place and poise of the editorial chair. He apparently, however, recovered in a measure from his false estimate of his position, ere the composition of his second article. Whether having blown out his blast of dogmatism, he sank to a more moderate tone from exhaustion, or whether it was from the advice of friends, he lays aside much of his insolence, and declaims in a less imperious and offensive style.

The assailants to whom we have lately had occasion to reply, have founded what they appear to have regarded as their most efficient objection, on a misrepresentation of our views of the laws of symbols and language. They have not only withheld from their readers the fact that we have presented specific rules for the interpretation of symbols and figures, but they have represented us as denying the existence of those media of revelation, and maintaining, that there is but one single law by which the whole body of the prophecies is to be interpreted, and that that is the law of the literal sense. This critic does not repeat that injustice. It is found, perhaps, to recoil with too much effect on its authors. He recognises the fact, that we have presented a new and peculiar system of rules, for the explication both of the symbolic and language prophecies, and acknowledges that he regards them as essentially correct. He says:

"His rules for the exposition of symbols, and the general interpretation of prophecy, are on the whole excellent, and more systematically and clearly defined, than by any writer within our knowledge."—Vol. i. p. 542.

This is indeed no great stretch of rectitude and candor. It is a large step, however, in advance of several other assailants. He thinks, nevertheless, that we carry the distinctions between symbols and figures, and the rules by which we explain them, too far.

"His chief fault on this point is, that the matter is *overstrained*;

his rules are too rigid for the popular style of the Bible. The nice distinctions which he makes between symbols and metaphors, and other figures, however reasonable in a philosophical treatise on rhetoric, are out of place, and often mislead, when applied to the unsystematic and free style of the Holy Scriptures."—P. 542.

We apprehend, he can have but very inadequately considered the subject, or he would scarcely have ventured to utter such extraordinary declarations. In the first place, unless such distinctions truly exist between symbols and metaphors, and other figures, as we maintain, it is quite apparent that the rules we have given for their interpretation can have no claim whatever to accuracy; for they are founded on the fact, that symbols and figures have identically the peculiar natures which we ascribe to them; and their adaptation to explain them depends wholly on their being of those distinguishing natures. If they are not, but instead of differing in such a manner, they are substantially the same, it is plain that the principles also on which they are used, instead of being wholly unlike, must be essentially similar. In denying therefore that such differences exist between them, as are contemplated in the laws we have given for their solution, this critic, notwithstanding his admission of the excellence of those laws, in effect denies their truth and propriety. He might as well deny, that the lines, angles, squares, and circles of geometry, have the peculiar natures which are ascribed to them by the definitions of that science, and yet admit that the axioms and rules of the science are true and appropriate to the solution of its various problems; as to deny that symbols and figures have the natures that, according to the definitions we have given, belong to them, and yet admit, that the rules for their interpretation, which are founded on those natures, are just, and suited to their solution.

No error, however, could be greater, or indicate a more unfortunate misconception of the subject, than the fancy which he entertains, that symbols and figures are not essentially unlike, but so resemble, and sometimes pass into each other, that one and the same rule is applicable to both. Had he attempted to verify this notion, by a reference to any of the symbols and figures of the Scriptures, he would have found himself involved in inextricable difficulties. Let us

signify nothing but the acts of that agent. If it were predictive therefore, it would be predictive of identically such a winged lion as the symbol itself, and exerting the identical acts, and passing through the changes which are affirmed of that: which, as they are altogether out of the sphere of nature, is absurd and impossible. He will find himself equally embarrassed in any attempt he may make to interpret any other of the symbols, by the laws of the metaphor. Let him apply them, if he pleases, to the symbols of the second vial, and not only are the angel, the vial, and the pouring of its contents on the sea, divested of their representative character and made to stand simply for themselves, but the sea upon which it fell, becomes a real sea, while the conversion of its waters to a resemblance of the blood of a dead man, and the death of every living thing in it, are made metaphorical, and describe processes of which the sea and its living things were the subjects; but of the real nature of which we have no clear information, and can form no idea. For what can a metaphorical change of the waters of the sea be, which is not the same, but is simply *like* a change by which they would become *like* the blood of a dead man? Or what can be meant by a metaphorical death of fish, testacea, mollusks, insects, and other living things that inhabit the sea? Can any one tell? Is a change that is simply *like* death, a mere suspension of consciousness, a loss of animation, a sleep; or what is it? Such would be the issue of an attempt to apply the laws of the metaphor to any of the other symbols.

This very confident critic, therefore, could scarcely have fallen into a more unfortunate error, than the denial he utters with so much positiveness, that any such "nice distinctions" exist, as we maintain, between symbols and metaphors, and other figures. To treat them according to his notion, would be not only to violate their nature, but to divest them entirely of their power to foreshow to us the future.

He is equally unfortunate in the fancy that there is a difference between the principle of symbols and figures when considered philosophically, and the "free" and "popular" mode in which they are used in the Scriptures. He says:—

"The symbols of the Bible, like its parables and allegories, are not cast in the philosophical, but in the popular and oriental mould.

They sometimes 'walk on all fours,' and sometimes 'touch only in one point.' Sometimes the symbolical is mixed with the metaphorical, and both with the literal, in the same paragraph, if not in the same sentence. See Rev. vi. and ix."

"One might as well apply the principles of Murray's English Grammar to the syntax of the Apocalypse, or the system of Edwardean Metaphysics to the use of the words 'head,' 'heart,' 'mind,' 'soul,' 'spirit,' 'understanding,' 'conscience;' or the system of modern scientific physiology to the biblical use of the words 'bowels,' 'nerves,' and 'veins,' &c., as attempt to restrain the meaning of the Scripture *symbols* to their strict philosophical and scientific use. Leviathan is not so tamed. The crucible here is out of place. Metaphysical exactness is not to be looked for in a book written not for the learned, but for the popular mind."—P. 543.

A more ludicrous attempt by mere confident assertion to settle a point which the writer manifestly does not comprehend, we have seldom witnessed. There is no such distinction, as he imagines, between a "strict philosophical and scientific use" of symbols, and their use in the Scriptures. This is manifest, in the first place, from the fact that there are no symbols, except those of the prophetic writings. There are no symbols in philosophy, either natural or metaphysical: there are none in the sciences, either the exact or the natural. Has not this writer extended his researches far enough to become aware of this fact? Does he regard the symbols of the Bible as only a part of a vast system that is common to all the branches of knowledge? that some are metaphysical, and some philosophical; that some belong to the demonstrative, and some to the practical sciences? An extraordinary fancy truly!

His error is manifest, in the next place, from the fact that the views we have presented of the nature of symbols, and their laws, are founded exclusively on the symbols of the Scriptures. He writes as though those definitions and laws were framed for a philosophic species of symbols that differ essentially from those of the sacred writings. But this is a total mistake. They are drawn altogether from the symbols of the divine word, and the interpretations that are there given of them by the revealing Spirit; and they are applicable exclusively to them, and are their true and infallible laws, as is seen from the fact that they are the laws by which the Holy

Spirit has interpreted all the symbols, of which the meaning is given in the sacred word; that they are in harmony with the analogies on which symbols are used; and that they furnish a natural and consistent solution of all those that are left uninterpreted by the Holy Spirit. There is as ample evidence that they are the genuine laws of prophetic symbols, as there is that the laws of grammar are the true laws of our language, or that the laws of gravitation and projection are the laws by which the movements of the planetary bodies are directed. The pretext, then, that they are adapted only to symbols of an entirely different class, which he represents as philosophic and scientific, is a misrepresentation into which he would not have fallen had hé not been essentially unacquainted with the subject. The oracular tone in which he utters himself is in admirable harmony, truly, with the absurd misconception which he thus betrays!

He offers it, as a proof, that no such "nice distinctions exist between symbols and metaphors," that "sometimes the symbolical is mixed with the metaphorical, and both with the literal in the same paragraph, if not in the same sentence:" and he refers to Rev. vi. and ix. as examples. He has fallen, however, into a serious error, as there is no metaphorical expression in the sixth chapter, and only one in the ninth; and the interpretation of that does not affect, in the slightest degree, the general sense of the vision. But supposing symbols, metaphors, and other figures do occur in the same paragraph, how does that show that they do not differ from each other in the manner we have represented, and are not severally to be interpreted by their proper laws? If they do not differ from each other clearly and indisputably, and if each has not the peculiar nature that marks its class, how is this critic able to distinguish them, and know that they are what he denominates them? And if they do thus differ, why should not each be interpreted by its proper laws, as much as though instead of occurring in the same, they were separated into different paragraphs? What admirable proofs he gives of his critical acumen! He admits that they differ essentially and continue to be distinguishable from each other, notwithstanding they occur in the same paragraph; and yet he assumes that their juxtaposition in the same paragraph so divests them of their distinguishing

natures, and confounds them with each other, that they are no longer to be treated as symbols and metaphors, and interpreted by their proper laws! A person able to talk so learnedly of philosophy and science ought not to have left the subject involved in such embarrassment. If symbols and metaphors lose their respective natures by being brought into proximity to each other, he should have informed us what the new nature is which they acquire; and if they are no longer to be interpreted by their proper laws, he should have stated what the new laws are by which they are to be construed. He ought to have stated, also, what the limits are within which symbols and metaphors exert on each other this modifying power. Through what distances is this extraordinary agency exerted? How far must a metaphor and a symbol be separated from each other, in order that they may retain their several natures, and remain subject to their appropriate laws? These,—if his assumptions are correct,—are plainly questions of the utmost moment. How is it, animated as he was with the purpose of freeing the subject from all its embarrassments, that he passed them without notice? We hope he will, in his next article, give them a share of attention proportioned to their intricacy and importance.

His reason for not treating symbols and metaphors as differing from each other, and interpreting them according to the principles on which they are generally used, is thus no reason whatever. The fact that they occur in the same chapter, on the same page, or in the same paragraph, does not affect their nature, or form any ground for not interpreting them by their proper laws. It creates no necessity, and forms no justification for perverting them, and forcing on them an arbitrary and false meaning. He might as well allege the occurrence of figurative and literal language, or of different kinds of figures in the same chapter or paragraph, as a reason for disregarding their respective natures, and subjecting them to constructions that divest them of their true, and charge them with a false sense.

He is not content, however, with the advancement of these extraordinary notions. In order to evade the results to which the laws of symbolization lead, he denies that symbols are employed on any such fixed principles that their

meaning can be evolved by any general rules, and maintains that their import is altogether vague and indeterminable. He says:

"Symbols in the Bible are as definite as other figures, or as common *words, and no more definite.* The symbols of the first seal, for instance (vi. chap.), denote *victory* and *prosperity;* but what victory or where, in church or state, by military or moral power, is no more determined by the symbol of the warrior, bow, and crown, than by the words, 'conquering and to conquer.'"—P. 543.

If this statement in respect to the symbols of the first seal be correct, it is undoubtedly true that they are not used on any settled principle, and cannot be interpreted by any fixed laws. For we then have no certainty what *the relation* is, in which they are employed, and therefore no means of determining what it is that they denote. And if this, as he represents, is true generally of symbols, then the whole of the so-called revelations that are conveyed through them, are no revelations whatever, but are inexplicable mysteries, as absolutely unintelligible as though they were written in a language of which we have no knowledge, or conveyed through symbols of which we have no description, and can form no idea. How beautifully this tallies with the professions with which he commences his article, the reader may see from the following passages:

"The Apocalypse, as the word signifies, is *a revelation* from God, *an unveiling of the future.* Not a few, however, treat the book as if the *apo* were dropped, and a veil thicker than that which shrouded the holy of holies, shrouded its mysteries from all human curiosity. They regard all attempts to decipher its hieroglyphics as labor lost; and a course of lectures on the Apocalypse, especially from the pulpit, about as edifying as a similar course on Mesmerism or spirit-rappings.

"Yet it is called by its infinite Author a Revelation;—the revelation of Jesus Christ;—and unless the word be here used out of all analogy with the rest of Scripture, it implies *a manifestation of the truth, intelligibility,* a book not beyond the intellectual apprehension of the prayerful student. . . . . .

"One object of this essay, is, to persuade those who have hitherto neglected this important part of divine revelation, as if it were intended to be inscrutable, and as if it were almost presumptuous and

impious to ask to understand what God means to conceal, to enter on its study with as much hope, and with as high expectations of enjoyment, as in exploring the hidden wisdom of Isaiah, Daniel, or Ezekiel."—Pp. 530, 531.

But if, as he asserts in respect to the first seal, there is no telling from the nature of the symbol and the acts that are ascribed to it, what the sphere is to which they whom it represents belong, nor what the acts are that are to be exerted by those whom it represents, then, plainly, no revelation is made through them. No intimation is given who the agents are that are meant to be foreshown, what the sphere of life is, whether church or state, in which they are to appear, nor what the nature of the acts are, whether moral or military, which they are to exert, or whether they are to belong to the domain of the arts, of learning, of philosophy, or of religion. But that is to strip them of all specific meaning, and reduce their prophetic power to the mere indication that *something* is to happen *somewhere* in the world, but where or of what species no one can know or form a reasonable conjecture. Our critic is thus quite as much at war here with himself and with the Apocalypse, as he is with us. He is equally at variance also with the great writers, Mede, Newton, Vitringa, Daubuz, Faber, and others, from whom, as we shall by-and-by see, he deems it an unpardonable presumption in us to dissent. Those writers not only regarded symbols generally as having a specific and determinable meaning, but each of them—with the exception of Sir Isaac Newton, who simply acquiesced in Mr. Mede's constructions—put a specific interpretation on the symbols of the first seal. Is he unaware of this fact? Notwithstanding the familiarity with their pages to which he pretends, and the high veneration in which he professes to hold them—so lofty and intense he represents, that his "*blood boiled*" on reading an article in the Journal, in which we pointed out some of the false methods they and others have pursued in the interpretation of the symbolic Scriptures—is he, in reality, so ignorant of their writings, as not to know that they gave a specific construction of all the principal symbols of the Apocalypse, and indicated the events in which they deemed such of them as they supposed

were verified, had had their fulfilment? If not, if he is aware of the character of their works, why does he allege that symbols are not used on any settled principles, and have no determinable meaning, as though it were a confutation exclusively of us? Why did he not inform his readers that "he treated the *whole world* of commentators" with "contempt" —"sneering at some who are to him as Hyperion to a Satyr," p. 544—with the same pertness and insolence with which he treats us? What, moreover, becomes of his lofty commendation of Mr. Barnes's volume on the Apocalypse, whose "plan of interpretation" he pronounces "sober, philosophical, and everything but fanciful?" Does he not, in the main at least, proceed professedly on the assumption that symbols have a definite and determinable meaning? Does he not give a specific interpretation of nearly the whole series of them, and point out the events generally as they are described on the pages of Gibbon and other writers, in which he regards the predictions made through them, as having had their accomplishment?

But, however oracularly he utters himself, or whatever it be that he affects to establish, he has the ill-luck, at every turn, to show that he has but the most confused and false ideas of the subject of which he is treating. Thus, he confounds himself by the admission that "symbols in the Bible are as definite as *other* figures, [figures simply, he perhaps means, as symbols are not figures,] or as common *words, and no more* definite. The symbols of the first seal denote *victory* and *prosperity;* but what victory or where, in church or state, by military or moral power, is no more determined by the symbol of the warrior, bow, and crown, than by the words 'conquering and to conquer.'" If the meaning of symbols is as definite and certain as that of words, it is unquestionably as definite as we have ever represented, and as need be. There is no uncertainty as to the meaning of the language generally of the Apocalypse. There is no part of the Sacred Volume, the philological meaning of which is less debated among commentators. And most certainly there is no doubt as to the meaning of the words, "conquering and to conquer." As the acts they denote are the acts of the warrior horseman, they of course signify conquests, which he was to achieve in his sphere as a warrior. What

they signify, however, as they are used to denote *his acts* as a warrior, and what *those acts used as symbols* of the acts of the *agent whom he symbolizes* signify, are wholly different questions. But if the symbol horseman, his weapon, and his symbolic acts, are as definite and certain in their meaning as the words "conquering and to conquer" are, as they are employed to denote his agency, then they clearly have no such indeterminateness as this critic asserts, but their meaning must be as easily determinable and as certain as that of the most unequivocal propositions, or terms of the language. How much wiser would it have been, if, instead of announcing opinions with such extreme positiveness on a subject of which he manifestly has no clear or correct ideas, this gentleman had begun by making himself acquainted, in some reasonable measure, with the proper meaning of his own language. He might then have escaped the discredit of such an extraordinary display of misconceptions and inconsistencies.

He next alleges, that though our rules of interpretation are correct, we adhere to them too rigidly, and carry them too far. He says:

> "His laws of symbolization are in general true and well developed; but in many cases in his application of them, they are so overstrained as to crucify the meaning of the text."—P. 543.

How strictly to adhere to a system of "true and well developed" laws, can be to overstrain them and crucify the meaning of the text, he does not inform us; and most will, probably, think the charge little less than an absurd contradiction. Is the meaning of language ever overstrained and crucified by a strict adherence in interpreting it to the legitimate laws of philology? Are the problems of geometry ever overstrained and crucified by the thorough application to them of the principles of that science? If not, why should the application of their legitimate laws to the symbols of the Scriptures overstrain them and crucify their meaning? Must their "true and well developed" laws be set aside, or reversed, in order to unfold their proper meaning? Is the assertion of such a doctrine anything less than maintaining that the true laws of symbolization are alto-

gether false; and that the genuine import of the symbols can only be obtained by interpreting them on principles that contradict their nature, and assign to them a signification that is wholly at war with their true meaning? Yet that is, in fact, the doctrine on which the reviewer proceeds. For that which he denominates an overstraining of the laws of symbolization, is a simple adherence to, instead of an abandonment of them, and adoption in their place of a directly opposite code, that wrests the symbols from their proper office, and makes them the vehicle of a false and absurd import. This is seen from the construction he puts, in exemplification of his notions, on the symbols of the first seal. Thus, he says, "The symbols of the first seal, for instance, denote *victory* and *prosperity;* but what victory or where, in church or state, by military or moral power, is no more determined by the symbol of the warrior, bow, and crown, than by the words 'conquering and to conquer.'" It is thus, by violating and reversing the first great law of symbols, that agents represent agents; acts, acts; and events, events, that he interprets the warrior, who went forth "conquering and to conquer," as denoting *the acts or events* that are foreshown, in place of the *agents* who were to exercise those acts and give rise to those events; and it is an inflexible adherence to that law, especially, which he denounces as overstraining it, and crucifying the meaning of the text, by which he, doubtless, means the vague and false meaning which he ascribes to it, and which is essential to the support of his system! It is his favorite theories of the great scheme of God's government, and the destiny of the race, to which the laws of symbolization, if legitimately applied, prove so fatal; not the symbols that are interpreted by them, or the text in which those symbols are described. If those laws could only be set aside or exchanged for their direct opposites; if the distinction between symbols and figures could be so frittered away that this interpreter might feel at liberty, if he chose, to apply to the one the laws of the other, as suited his caprice, or the exigency of his theory, then his system could be saved from destruction and established with a satisfactory measure of ease and strength; and on no other condition can its crumbling fabric be prevented from speedy overthrow! Such is the real import of his objections. He can-

not safely deny the truth of the laws of symbols which we have stated. They are too manifestly sanctioned by the revealing Spirit in the interpretations given by him of many of the symbols; they are too obviously founded on the principles of analogy. They are to be *indirectly* assailed therefore and evaded, by denouncing a rigid observance of them as an overstraint, which tortures the prophecies, and crucifies their genuine sense!

He finally alleges that "some" of our "rules can never be maintained."

> "One, for instance, and a favorite one, is that the Saviour can never be symbolized by a creature, nor by anything but himself. Whereas he is evidently symbolized by a Lamb that had been slain, in the 5th chapter, and by an angel with his right foot upon the sea, and the other upon the land, in the 10th chapter."—P. 543.

The assumption, however, that the Lamb of the fifth chapter was a literal, sacrificial animal of that name, a mere symbol of Christ, and not the Lamb of God himself, is mistaken. This is seen from the fact, that he was the being by whose blood the living creatures and elders and those whom they represented, out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, were redeemed, and made unto God kings and priests; and he was indisputably the Saviour himself, not a mere visionary animal which had not in fact been slain, and whose blood, if shed, would have had no power to redeem. It is seen from the fact also, that the Lamb of that vision was the object of supreme worship to the living creatures, elders, and angels, and was adored as worthily possessing all power, and receiving all the homage that are due to the Deity. It cannot be supposed that such ascriptions of rights and prerogatives, and such expressions of adoration and love, were addressed to a mere unintelligent creature. Such homage of an animal were doubtless as impious and impossible, as a similar worship were of an idol. It is seen, likewise, from the acts which the Lamb himself exercised. He received the book from the hand of him who sat upon the throne, and opened its seals. These were acts not simply of an intelligence, but of an intelligence who had hands. To suppose that a mere animal performed them, is to contradict its nature, and to exhibit the vision as immea-

surably incongruous and unsuitable to the Divine perfections. It is certain also from the fact that the being who received the book and opened the seals, is declared to be the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and the Root of David, which are the peculiar titles of the Messiah, and are not, and cannot be the denominatives of a mere sacrificial lamb. And, finally, this is certain from the consideration that the Lamb is used in the prophecy, as the denominative of the incarnate Saviour himself in his own person, and not of an animal that appeared as his representative. This is clear from the fact that the being called the Lamb, is in the same passage denominated the Lion of the tribe of Judah, and the Root of David, which are indisputably the titles exclusively of Christ, and not of a mere symbol of him: and it is placed beyond all doubt by the fact, that it is used in some twenty other instances in the prophecy, and in every one of them denotes the incarnate Redeemer in his own person. Thus who can doubt that it was the Almighty Redeemer from whom the kings and their armies wished to secrete themselves when they "said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb?" Who can doubt that it was to him to whom the elder referred, when he said of the innumerable multitude having palm branches in their hands, "These are they who came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb;" . . . and "the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall feed them and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters?" Can these acts of infinite intelligence, power, and love, to which the incarnate Redeemer alone is competent, have been ascribed to a mere animal? Whom else but the Saviour himself can the term denote in the passage in which it is foretold that the beast shall be worshipped by "all that dwell upon the earth, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb *slain from the foundation of the world*?" Was any lamb but the Lamb of God, who was made flesh and dwelt among us, slain from the foundation of the world? Is there any book of life in which the names of the redeemed are written, but his? Can any one fail to see that it is to him to whom the song of the heavenly hosts referred, in which they said, "The marriage of the Lamb is come, and his

wife hath made herself ready," and they are pronounced "blessed who are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb?" Can any one doubt that it is he who is meant when the New Jerusalem is said to be the symbol of the bride the Lamb's wife? And that it is he who is denoted when it is said that "the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple" of the New Jerusalem; that "the Lamb is the light of it," and that "the river of the water of life" that runs through it, "proceeds out of the throne of God and of the Lamb?" The reviewer is altogether mistaken, therefore, in asserting that the being who is denominated the Lamb in the fifth chapter, was a mere animal. The whole use of the denominative in the prophecy, and all the titles, acts, and prerogatives ascribed to him in that vision, concur to make it indisputable that it is used there as his peculiar and official name as the incarnate Redeemer.

He is equally in error in stating that the Saviour is symbolized by the angel of the tenth chapter, who set his right foot on the sea, and his left on the land. There not only is not the slightest ground, so far as we are aware, for that supposition, but it is against the laws of analogy, and is confuted by the event. The agents actually symbolized by the angel—the Reformers—appeared in person in the Roman empire at the time to which the prophecy refers; precisely as the agents denoted by the beasts, the witnesses, and others, appeared in person in their respective times; and that is the law universally of the prophecy. To suppose, therefore, that the angel symbolizes Christ, is to suppose that Christ visibly appeared in the world at the period to which the vision refers, and publicly exercised the acts which are represented by those of the angel: but no such visible and public interposition of Christ took place at the Reformation to which the prediction, as is almost universally held, relates. And this writer himself, instead of holding that Christ then visibly appeared in the world, maintains that his second coming is not to take place till the final judgment after the thousand years have passed! What charming self-consistency! What an admirable comprehension of the results to which his assertions lead him!

Nor is it generally thought by commentators that the angel symbolizes Christ. So far from it, not a few regard him as Christ himself; while they very generally hold that

whether Christ or an angel, he is a symbol of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and the great and influential Protestant teachers that succeeded them; and that is the construction adopted by Mr. Barnes himself, whom it is one of the reviewer's objects in this article to sanction and eulogize. Whether, then, Christ is ever symbolized by a creature or not, he plainly is not in either of these passages.

The reviewer proceeds to ask, "Why should he not be symbolized by creatures in the New Testament, as well as typified by them in the Old?" We answer first, The offices of a symbol and of a type of him are wholly different. Were a creature used as a symbol of him, as in the vision of the fifth chapter of the Apocalypse, made the object of homage, and exhibited as exercising the peculiar attributes and prerogatives of the eternal Word, it would be equivalent to a deification of the symbol; for a symbol must be precisely what it is put forth and assumed to be, in its symbolic office; otherwise it has no adequacy and suitableness to be the representative of that which it is employed to foreshow. If a symbol were not naturally in the sphere in which it appears, what its name and its acts properly denote, then it would follow that the agents which it symbolizes may not be in their sphere what their name, and the acts foreshown of them, naturally denote: and thence the prediction would be wholly vague and indeterminate. As there would be no means of knowing what the deviations from nature were to be, there would be no means of knowing what class of agents were represented, nor when the prediction had its fulfilment.

No such consequence, however, was involved in the use of a lamb, for example, as a *type* of Christ; as the office of a sacrificial lamb was not strictly that of a representative of him: instead it was a mere passive instrument through which the offerer expressed his faith in the Redeemer, who was at length to offer himself as a sacrifice to God for him. No faith was exercised in the victim lamb itself; no divine attributes or prerogatives were ascribed to it. It was not exhibited as exercising any divine acts. It was a mere passive object towards which the offerer exerted certain prescribed acts for the purpose of expressing his sense of his need of expiation and redemption, and his trust in the great sacrifice to come for the blessings of pardon and redemption.

A creature might be used as a type of Christ, therefore, with perfect propriety, while it would have been wholly contradictory to its nature, and inconsistent with the divine prerogatives, to have used it as a symbol of him.

But he asks, "Why should he not be symbolized by inanimate things, since the Holy Spirit,—our author being judge,—is symbolized by the seven lamps of fire?" We answer: The Father, in all the instances in which he appears in the visions, appears in his peculiar station and relation as the creator and ruler of the universe, possessing all divine attributes, and exercising all divine prerogatives; and is in that relation acknowledged and worshipped by creatures. The Son also, in all the instances of his appearance, appears as the incarnate Word, the Redeemer of men, the Head of the church, invested with all power, and exercising the peculiar acts that belong to his office as the King of kings, the Lord of lords, and the judge of all. Those attributes, prerogatives, relations, and acts, of the Father and the Word, are thus essentially unlike any that creatures possess and exert; and hence no creature can appropriately represent them in these respects. It were in effect to deify a creature to exhibit him as creator, supreme lawgiver, redeemer, or an object of homage to other beings.

The Holy Spirit, on the other hand, never appears in the visions in a visible, personal form, nor in the relation of creator, lawgiver, or judge. Instead, as he is an invisible agent, he appears by representatives *that fill an office like that which he fills*, which is that of an agent, acting in subordination to the Father and Christ, *and exerting enlightening influences on men*:—a relation and agency like that of lamps that shed light on the eyes of men, and which may appropriately, therefore, be represented by such a symbol; as men themselves are in the resembling relation of teachers, symbolized by stars. That relation and agency are not peculiar to the Holy Spirit; and as no divine prerogatives are ascribed to the lamps that are used as the symbols of him, and no homage paid them, it involves no encroachment on the divine prerogatives to employ them as his representatives, nor any incongruity with the nature of the agent used, as a dependent and unconscious existence. That lamps, then, are used with perfect propriety, as symbols of the Holy Spirit in that

"But the great fault of this writer, in this, as in most of his other writings (and he ought to know how the public regard it), is his *overweening self-conceit;* his despotic dogmatism; his supercilious contempt for all who have gone before him. Really, in taking him up for the first time, you would suppose that not a ray of light on the subject of the interpretation of prophecy had ever before reached our benighted earth! Mede, Lowman, Lowth, Hurd, Fleming, the Newtons, Faber, Elliot, and the whole host of German and English writers, had not a distant idea on the subject; and had need to learn of our New York interpreter, 'which be the first principles of the oracles of God.'

"This is no caricature. *Our blood boiled* in reading the first numbers of his Theological and Literary Journal, at the supreme contempt with which he treated the whole world of commentators, sneering at some who were to him as 'Hyperion to a satyr.' And there is so much of the same infallible dogmatism in this treatise, that it will nearly destroy the credit which the book can really claim.

"It is really amusing to observe with what ease he disposes of Vitringa, Daubuz, Faber, Sir Isaac Newton, and others, just by kicking up a dust of *technicals*, as convincing as if he threw up the parts of speech, the conjugations, and declensions, helter-skelter into the air!"—P. 544.

Our readers will not deem it necessary that we should confute this tirade of effrontery and traduction. Most of them will doubtless regard it as the ebullition of a weak and malicious mind, enraged at its conscious inability to meet the objections which we have urged against his favorite theories of the administration God is to exercise over the world. Others will look at it, perhaps, as an effort to avenge himself and his party, for our recent criticisms on his favorite, Mr. Barnes, and possibly, for the exposures we have made of the errors and obliquities of the leaders of a theological faction, to which some of those with whom this writer is associated have been disposed to attach themselves; and there is a touch of truth, very probably, in each of those views. His eyes are undoubtedly so squinted and jaundiced by passion and party feeling, that nothing that proceeds from our pen can appear otherwise than distorted to him, and tinged with a false hue.

Others will probably ascribe it to hallucination. Persons of a certain temperament, sometimes when under high

excitement, lose the clue of their associations, and refer the effects that are wrought in them to altogether wrong causes; and this is the reason, in a measure perhaps, of the course he here pursues. He undoubtedly regards a slashing, imperious, and reckless dogmatism, as the most effective mode of writing; and accustomed to connect the idea of impressiveness and authority with that style, it is possible that in his confusion and bewilderment, he imagined it was by that, that the strong impressions were produced in him, that were in fact wrought merely by clear statements and unanswerable reasonings.

The main reason, however, of his assailing us in this manner, is, we doubt not, that he regards an oracular, flippant, and abusive style, as an indication of smartness and authority. It bespeaks, according to his notion, an elevated genius. His beau-ideal of an eloquent and popular writer is that of an impudent and dashing swaggerer, who relies on mere assertion to prove what he wishes to establish, and on sneers and abuse, to confute his adversary. This is seen from the whole range of his article. He relies exclusively on mere "despotic dogmatism" to establish the positions he advances. Let the reader recur to the passages we have quoted, and he will see that they are a mere tissue of oracular assertions. Not a shadow of anything like proof is alleged to sustain them, and they are fair specimens of his usual method. He seldom attempts to reason.

But how is it that dogmatism, one of the qualities on which he thus plumes himself as rare excellences, is falsely ascribed by him to us, as a fatal fault? The reason lies undoubtedly in the immeasurable self-conceit, and party arrogance, with which he is inflated. He appears to have the feeling, that he and his party alone have the right to utter their sentiments; that others who disagree with him, should venture to state their views, and above all, should sustain them by unanswerable proofs, no matter how calmly and properly they are expressed, nor how legitimately they are verified; he regards as a presumptuous infringement of his rights, and violation of decorum; while *he* claims it as a prerogative, to dogmatize, instead of reasoning, and determine questions by his oracular fiat. This he unblushingly and exultingly avows. Thus he says:

"It is encroaching on *our province* as Reviewers. *We* only have the right to speak *ex cathedra*, and assume infallibility as who should say

"'I am sir oracle,
And when I ope my lips, let no dog bark.'

"From high authority and long prescription, reviewers have the right to sit like Nebuchadnezzar, when 'whom he would, he slew, and whom he would, he kept alive; and whom he would, he set up, and whom he would, he put down.' We cannot allow our author the liberty quite yet, to cut and slay, Caligula-like, as if he would gladly decapitate all Rome at once."—P. 545.

He thus openly proclaims, that he acts the part in his editorial sphere of a despotic and reckless dogmatist, and arrogates it as his peculiar prerogative. This is the reason, accordingly, of the insolence which he displays to us. Dizzy with his imagined editorial importance, and eager to try his powers of assertion and bravado, he gives the rein to his impudence and recklessness, and flatters himself that nothing more is necessary to induce the public to accept him as an oracle, and reject and denounce whomever he attempts to put down. "This is no caricature." He not only sat for the portrait, but he drew it himself; and no exaggeration or distortion can add to its hideousness. What a delicate compliment he pays to his party, in assuming that they will of course contemplate it with admiration, and reward it with applause! That a trace exists among them of intelligence, integrity, good taste, or even decency, he seems not to suspect. They are, he has the coolness to presume, on a level with himself! He will find, however, in the end, that he has only succeeded in making himself the object of the contempt, with which he aimed to overwhelm others.

The reviewer, having thus announced in his first article his judgment respecting the writers on the Apocalypse, whom he criticises, proceeds in his second to contrast his post-millennial, with what he represents as the pre-millennial theory of Christ's coming, and to allege what heregards as fatal objections to the latter. This part of his essay, though less rude and scurrilous than the former, betrays the same gross misconception of the subject, and is marked by the same pertness and dogmatism. He conducts the discussion on the

assumption that mere noise, bravado, and menace, are to settle the question. No indication appears, that he has ever carefully studied the points on which he announces his opinion; nor that he has any tolerable understanding either of the positions he advocates, or those which he assails. He puts forth statements with the most unhesitating assurance, respecting the views held by millenarians, so palpably wrong, that not one in a hundred probably, of his own party, can fail to see that they are total misrepresentations; while on the other hand, he advances notions that are generally rejected by his party, and are fraught with the confutation of his whole theory. He first treats of "the nature of the promised kingdom." He says:

"Millenarians make it a literal personal reign of Christ with his saints on the earth for a thousand years. To this view we object: 1. That it is carnal, literalistic, and Jewish. This was the very kingdom which the Jews, 1800 years ago, expected, and under the delusive expectation of which they missed the true kingdom and salvation of Messiah. They looked for a political empire, and wished to place on the head of Jesus a literal crown, have him wield an ivory sceptre, and make literal arrows sharp in the hearts of his enemies."—No. V., p. 26.

This is a specimen of the crude misstatements and shallow declamation which he attempts to pass off on his readers under the name of "argument!" He in the first place *assumes* that if Christ is to reign in person on the earth, his kingdom must be merely carnal and political, like that which the Jews, who rejected him at his first coming, expected and desired; and he makes that assumption the basis of his objection. For, otherwise, how does it appear from the fact that Christ is to reign in person on the earth, that his kingdom must be carnal and political, like that which mere human monarchs exercise over their empires? How does it follow if, instead of being such a mere empire over bodies, it is to be an empire pre-eminently over minds, and an empire of righteousness, wisdom, sanctitude, and love; and not in spite of, but rather because it is to be exercised by him in person? If he cannot prove from the nature of the case that a personal reign must be a "carnal" reign, and thence a reign of mere force, and over bodies, such as ordinary monarchs exercise,

he manifestly cannot prove that Christ's reign, if personal, is to be carnal. The first step in his "argument," thus, instead of a step in logic, is a mere assumption of the point he professes to prove; and an assumption involving an infinite traduction of the Redeemer. For to assert that he cannot exercise a personal reign on the earth, that shall be of any higher order than that which the Jews, who rejected him, desired, is clearly to deny his perfections, and reduce him to a level with the ordinary lawless and bloody monarchs who have established or inherited empires, and reigned over them by violence and unrighteousness. And to assert that of a reign of Christ here, and on the ground of necessity, from the nature of the case, is in effect to assert it equally of his reign in heaven; and imply that his kingdom in that world, in which he reigns in person, is a carnal, Jewish kingdom, precisely like that which the Jews, 1800 years ago, expected and desired that he would exercise. Was a more awful impeachment of Christ's sanctitude, wisdom, and grace ever uttered? What could save this presumptuous dogmatist from the guilt of unpardonable blasphemy, were it not that from his want of perspicacity, and the blinding and bewildering influence of his vanity, he can propound the most repulsive errors and revolting contradictions, without a consciousness of their character? What a beautiful example of his method of determining questions, without inquiry and without knowledge, by flippant and reckless assertion! As it does not follow at all from the nature of a personal reign, that if Christ reigns in person on earth, his kingdom must be carnal, and corporeal merely, and for mere political and economic ends, like ordinary earthly monarchs; the doctrine that he is to reign here in person, does not of necessity or naturally imply that his kingdom is to be of that nature. Nor would such a supposition spring up or find a place for a moment in a mind that was not deplorably devoid of just conceptions of his perfections and purposes, or sadly bewildered by false speculations. The reviewer manifestly makes himself and his fallen fellow creatures, his measure of Christ, instead of forming his estimate of Christ's kingdom from him. In the next place, it is on the same false assumption that he founds the charge that the kingdom which millenarians hold Christ is to rule on the earth, is to be such a

mere carnal, corporeal, and political kingdom, as was the object of Jewish expectation and desire, at the period of his first advent. He founds his charge on them, on his misrepresentation of Christ. Not a particle of evidence does he present that they entertain the views of Christ's kingdom which he ascribes to them. Nor could he, had he attempted it. His denominating a kingdom that is ruled by Christ in person, carnal, seems designed merely to disgrace it, and make it an object of prejudice; by implying that it is to be debased by sensuality and sin. But what objection can it be to a kingdom that its subjects are in the natural body, if they are raised to spotless sanctitude? Will there be no moral beauty and dignity in such an empire? Is it unworthy of Christ's perfections to raise mankind from the thraldom of sin and misery to the glory and bliss of such a condition? Is it a spectacle from which Christians should turn with disgust; and traduce and blacken with insolence and ribaldry? What an astonishing hallucination it indicates! What a pitiable inconsideration of Christ's infinite perfections and the grandeur of his designs!

Having thus shown that he has no comprehension of the subject which he treats with so much positiveness, and that he proceeds in his declamation against millenarians on the grossest misrepresentation of their views, he adduces a second allegation.

"2. It is not the kingdom which our Saviour and his apostles preached. The grand topic of his preaching was the kingdom of heaven! To explain its nature and reveal its mysteries, he uttered scores of parables, saying expressly, again and again, the kingdom o heaven is like this or like that; and it would be strange and imply no small censure on his ministry, if after all an honest earnest reader could not gather a general idea of the nature of his kingdom. And yet would one in ten thousand gather from all his teaching the idea of a personal visible, outward reign? Anything like a political empire? Would you gather it from the parable of the sower, or of the wheat and tares, or of the leaven and mustard seed, or pearl of great price, or treasure hid in the field. Would you gather it from his refusing the crown? or from his declaration to Pilate, 'My kingdom is not of this world!' What could he have meant but to say 'I seek no earthly throne, no golden sceptre, no legion of soldiers

no sword nor spear, no kingdom like that of Cæsar! My kingdom is a *moral* kingdom, established, extended, and built up by means of *truth*. Of my kingdom Cæsar need have no jealousy."—P. 26.

He proceeds in this "argument" on the assertion he had before uttered, that millenarians hold that "the proper kingdom of Christ begins and ends with the thousand years," and on the implied charge therefore that they maintain that Christ neither has any kingdom now, nor will have after the close of the thousand years. But no misrepresentation could be greater or more inexcusable. The reviewer is probably but very imperfectly acquainted with their views; and is so blinded by prejudice as to catch but a faint and vacillating glimpse of facts that lie within the sphere of his observation; yet it is not to be believed that he is so ignorant as not to know that these imputations are altogether groundless and deceptive. If he has not read enough to be aware that that is their character, what competence has he to treat of the subject? Millenarians entertain no such notions as he ascribes to them. They hold as distinctly and firmly as he and his party do, that Christ instituted his kingdom on the earth at his first coming, and that it still subsists here. They hold also—at least we and many others do—that he is for ever to have a kingdom here after the close of the thousand years, and is to reign over it for ever in person. While, however, they hold he now has a kingdom here, they maintain that it is to be established in a higher and more effective form at his second coming at the commencement of the thousand years, and that it is then to be distinguished from its present condition especially by his personal presence, and the presence as kings and priests of the risen and glorified saints. Had the reviewer had the justice to state this fact, the despotic assertions which he employs to sustain his allegation would have lost all their point; as would those of his second "argument," which is a repetition of what he affirms here. But it suited his taste and policy better to set up a man of straw, and make a display of his skill and prowess in demolishing it. And it enabled him to keep out of sight the point on which the question turns. If he had candidly stated that millenarians maintain that though Christ already has a kingdom in the world, he is yet to establish it in a new

and far more glorious form at his second coming, and is then to reign over it in person, and cause his risen saints to reign with him, he would have found it necessary, if upright, to discuss the question whether the Scriptures in fact authorise that belief; and would have been obliged, therefore, to consider the passages that expressly foreshow the investiture of Christ with the dominion of the earth and the institution of his kingdom in a new form at his second coming: such as Dan. vii. 13, 14, 18, 27; Rev. xi. 15–19. He now makes no allusion to these and similar passages, but conceals from his readers what God has explicitly revealed on the subject, and imposes on them the pretence that in showing that the kingdom of heaven was established 1800 years ago, he proves that it is not to be instituted in a new form at a future period.

His remarks on some of Christ's parables are equally deceptive. He alleges the fact that in certain of the Saviour's discourses he makes no allusion to his personal reign on earth during the thousand years, as a proof that neither he nor the prophets or apostles announce such a reign in any other passages: and by this artifice endeavors to betray his readers into the impression that the Scriptures nowhere contain a revelation of Christ's personal reign on the earth! This method of discussion is worthy of one who claims the right to settle questions by his mere asseveration, and denounces and abuses those as rash and dogmatical who venture to respect God's testimony rather than his.

The consideration that no reference is made in some of the parables to Christ's personal reign on the earth, is no proof that that reign is not foreshown in other passages. Those parables are designed to illustrate other features of Christ's kingdom, and some in relation to men generally, and some in relation to individuals. Thus the parable of the sower is designed to show the reception which the gospel was to meet during the present dispensation from the different classes of men to whom it was to be proclaimed. But the fact that that parable is verified through a long series of ages, does not prove that the Scriptures do not in other passages teach that, at a later period, a new dispensation is to be introduced, under which all nations are to become obedient to the gospel. The parables of the pearl of great price and the treasure hid

in the field, are designed, on the other hand, to show that those who receive the gospel will regard its blessings as inestimably more precious than any other gift. But they surely do not prove that Christ is not to reign on the earth, nor that his reign is not among the great certainties that give preciousness and glory in the eyes of his people to his salvation. The parable of the mustard seed teaches, that though his kingdom, at its first institution, was to be small, and apparently unlikely ever to obtain any considerable size, it was at length to rise into conspicuity and strength. But what light does this throw on the question whether other passages teach or not that Christ is, during the thousand years, to reign in person on the earth? These parables plainly contribute nothing to the object for which the reviewer quotes them. On the other hand, however, the parable of the leaven, if the meal is taken as a representative of mankind generally, confutes his theory; as it shows that the whole of the race, nations, and individuals, are in time to be brought under the saving power of the gospel. But that he denies, and holds that "the millennium is to be a mere extension and perfection of the present dispensation;" though the vast majority of the inhabitants of the earth will be holy and eminently so. But how can this last be, if the parable of the sower exemplifies the reception the gospel is to meet from men throughout the whole period of its proclamation? How can it be, if Christ's answer to the question, "Are there few that be saved," relates to all time?—"Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go in thereat!" But his theory is still more emphatically confuted by the parable of the wheat and tares, which represents that Satan, the sower of the tares, is to be abroad and active, and that the wheat and tares are to continue to grow together till the time of the harvest, which is to be at Christ's second coming; for that indicates first, that his coming is to precede the millennium, inasmuch as Satan is, during that period, to be bound and imprisoned, so that he will not deceive the nations: and next it shows that the tares, instead of dying out, so as to bear but a small proportion to the wheat, are to continue through the whole of the present dis-

pensation, on essentially the same scale as they did in the early ages of Satan's activity, and do still.

His second argument is, in like manner, directed to a point that is not at issue. Its aim is to show that Christ's kingdom was instituted at his first coming. But that millenarians do not dispute. They hold it as firmly as the reviewer does. From that, however, he *infers* that it is not to be established in a new form at his second coming and reigned over by him in person during the thousand years. But it does not follow from it, any more than any other irrelevant and groundless conclusion. The supposition is absurd, and as much against the reviewer's theory as it is against the views held by millenarians; for if, as he assumes, the mere fact that the kingdom of Christ exists in such a form as it now does, is a proof that it is never to be changed to another, it results that it is for ever to continue in its present state, instead of being raised from the imperfections with which it is now defaced, to the purity and wisdom which the reviewer holds are to mark it during the millennium. But it is not only a false conclusion: it is directly against the explicit revelation that Christ's kingdom is to undergo a great change at the destruction of the wild beast, which is to precede the millennium, by his investiture with the dominion of the earth, and the exaltation of the saints to reign with him, Dan. vii.; that at the seventh trumpet the kingdoms of the world are to become his; that he is then to judge the dead, and give reward to his servants the prophets, and the saints, small and great; and that he is thereafter to reign for ever and ever, Rev. xi. 10–19; and that after the separation of the tares from the wheat has taken place, the righteous are to shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.—Matt. xiii. 40–43. Why did the reviewer keep these and the numerous other similar passages out of sight, and assume that no such change in Christ's administration is to take place,—unless he felt that clap-trap declamation is better adapted than truth to his object?

For an answer to his remarks in respect to the means by which the millennium is to be introduced, we refer our readers to our reply to the Princeton Review on that subject.

He pursues the same deceptive course in his fourth argument in regard to the judgment. The question on that topic,

between him and those whom he assails, is, whether the Scriptures teach that there is to be a judgment at the commencement of the thousand years, and another after their termination. But instead of discussing that, he employs himself in asserting that the judgment foreshown, Matt. xxv., which millenarians hold, is to precede the thousand years, and Rev. xx. 11–15, which is to follow them, do not present any indications that there are to be *any further conversions of men*—a point which no one disputes, and that has no connexion whatever with the subject in debate. Thus, he says:

"2. The picture of the judgment given by our Lord in the xxv. of Matthew, gives no idea of salvation by *further conversions*, but only of announcing the unchanging destinies of men according to their previous character and conduct. Read the passage, and behold the Judge separating the two classes, *never more to mingle;* hear him decree the righteous an everlasting kingdom, and doom the wicked to eternal fire; and listen to the issue: 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal;' and then say, if all this is *premillennial*, what further hope will there be for unconverted sinners?"—Pp. 30, 31.

But who supposes that those two sentences, which relate exclusively to *the classes on whom they are pronounced*, "give an idea of salvation by further conversions?" We certainly do not, nor do any millenarians, as far as we are aware. But it does not follow from their not giving such an idea, that there *are to be* no further conversions of *other persons;* nor that other passages of the Sacred Word do not expressly foreshow them. He might as well allege the fact, that the dejection of the wild beast and false prophet into the lake of fire and brimstone, or the binding of Satan, which he admits is to precede the millennium, give no idea of further conversions, as proof that no further conversions are to take place. He, however, *assumes* that the judgment foreshown, Matt. xxv., is to extend to the whole of the living: but that is to beg the point he should have proved. It does not appear from the parable itself. The sentences exhibit the two great classes on whom they are pronounced, as consisting of persons who had shown what their dispositions were towards Christ by their conduct towards his disciples in a time of trial, and probably of persecution. One had shown

a profound interest in them by visiting them in sickness and in prison, and administering to their wants; the other had shown that they had no sympathy with them by leaving them to suffer without interposing for their relief. As these acts are generally practicable only to persons who have grown up, and have immediate access to the oppressed and suffering, they would naturally include but a small part of the whole population of the globe. Myriads, at least, of the young especially, could scarcely take a part in any such public manifestation of feeling; and the unequivocal prediction in the Scriptures that nations are to survive the coming of Christ, and live under his reign, show that it is to be so. Why does the reviewer shun the trial of the question by the passages that directly treat of it, and prefer to rest his cause on unauthorized assumptions and assertions? He proceeds in the same style:

"The vision presented (Rev. xx. 11–15) makes the same impression. The great white throne is set; the dead, small and great, stand before God; the books are opened, and the dead (observe, not the *living*, but the race whose probation is ended, and on whom death has already set his seal) are judged out of the things written in the books, according to their works: 'And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire.'

"Now say, is there any hope of a millennium after this? After this period is not the door of hope shut on all the unsaved? Yet they make the judgment pre-millennial, for they cannot otherwise make the advent pre-millennial. The advent and the day of judgment are inseparable.

"Millenarians, therefore, may be shut up to this dilemma: either the judgment is not pre-millennial, or the millennium is not a season of *probation;* for the judgment evidently ends probation. And if probation is ended, where is their hope of the vast harvest of persons to be saved in the millennium?"—P. 31.

What an extraordinary cluster of shallow blunders, bold misrepresentations, and unblushing inconsistencies is grouped in these few sentences! They are a fair specimen of the random and slap-dash style in which he affects to settle critical questions. In the first place, he proceeds on the representation that millenarians hold that the judgment of the dead, foreshown Rev. xx. 11–15, is to *precede* instead of fol-

lowing the thousand years. For he asks, "Is there any hope of *a millennium after this?* *After* this period is not the door of hope shut on all the unsaved?" and asserts that "yet they make the judgment [i. e. *this* judgment] pre-millennial: for they cannot otherwise make the advent pre-millennial." No statement could be more unauthorized. No millenarians regard the judgment of the unholy dead, symbolized in that passage, as to *precede* the thousand years. It is expressly shown, verses 5, 6, that it is not to take place till after the thousand years are passed; and it is these identical passages which millenarians allege as teaching that there are to be *two* judgments, one at the commencement and one at the close of the millennium. This fact he conceals, and attempts to "shut them up to a dilemma," by implying that they hold *with him*, that there is to be but one judgment, and representing that they regard this, which is indisputably to *follow* the millennium, as to precede it! He adopts this short method of confounding them, doubtless, in virtue of the right with which he considers himself as invested, by his editorial office, of establishing facts, and settling debates by his oracular assertions.

In the next place, he has fallen into an extraordinary inconsistency with himself. He states on a previous page, that he regards the resurrection of the dead, symbolized Rev. xx. 11–15, as representing, *not a corporeal resurrection*, but a mere "reappearance of the old spirit of persecution." He says:

> "We regard these resurrections, both [Rev. xx. 4, and 12–14], as symbolical; the former denoting simply a resurrection or *revival of Christianity*, after 1260 years' slumber and comparative death during the reign of the Beast; and the latter as a resurrection or reappearance on earth of the old spirit of *persecution*, which had slumbered or been kept in abeyance during the long and prosperous period of the millennium."—P. 23.

Now, however, the second resurrection has become a *real* one. "The *dead*," he says, "observe, not the *living*, but the race whose probation is ended, and on whom death has already set his seal, are judged." Which of these constructions—asserted with equal positiveness—does the reviewer

wish to be considered as holding; or is this to be regarded as an exemplification of the prerogative he claims of determining points, in any form he pleases, by a despotic fiat?

But, in the third place, how does the fact, that those who are to be subjects of the second resurrection, are not to enjoy any further probation, prove that no other persons are? How could it prove that point, any more than the fact that those then to be raised are to be destroyed, proves that all other human beings are also to be consigned to the same perdition? He has fallen into a singular confusion of thought. It plainly is not on the ground of *their* theory of the judgment, but of *his own*, that he infers that there can be no probation or salvation to any after that event. Yet he treats it as an inference from *theirs*. He first assumes, virtually, that their views are the same as his, and then because it follows from *his* that after the judgment there can be no further salvation of men, he claims that it follows also from theirs, which preclude that inference! What admirable discrimination! What exemplary fairness!

His "argument" respecting "the resurrection body" is, in like manner, founded on a false notion he has formed respecting it, not on the word of God. He says:

> "Our difficulty is this. From 1 Cor. xv. 42–54, it is indisputably evident that the resurrection-body is to be *spiritual*, *incorruptible*, and *immortal;* in other words, will be unearthly and unfit to live with flesh and blood on the earth *as it now is*. To breathe our air, be nourished by our food, and to have any fellowship with the things of the present earth, they must be of the earth, earthy. Millenarians are consistent, therefore, in conflagrating and renovating this earth before they make it the abode of the glorified saints.
>
> "But they are inconsistent in creating a new heaven and a new earth, fit only for spiritual bodies and for glorified saints, and in making it still the abode of the wicked and of men in the flesh."—Pp. 31, 32.

But whence did the reviewer learn that the resurrection-body is to be unfitted by its spirituality to reside in such a world as this? How does he know but that it may be adapted by its peculiar nature, in a higher degree than we now are, for precisely such an abode? And whence did he learn that if the glorified saints dwell in this world, they

must not only breathe our air, but be nourished by our food? Can anything be clearer than that these are mere arbitrary assumptions, and that he builds his declamation on his own unauthorized theory, not on the word of God? Where, on the other hand, did he learn that the new heaven and new earth are to be unfit for the abode of men in the natural body? How convenient to settle questions, in this *ex cathedrâ* manner, not only without a shadow of authority from the Scriptures, but against their clear revelations? For if the new earth is to be unfit for the residence of men, how is it that the nations are, in fact, to live on it, and that God is to dwell on it with them, free them from the curse of sin, and give them to walk in the light of the New Jerusalem? How is it that they are to build and plant, eat the fruits of their fields, rear children, and enjoy all the forms of happiness for which our nature was originally fitted? Rev. xxi. xxii., Isa. lxv. But instead of noticing these clear teachings of the Sacred Word, it suits the reviewer to determine the point by his own arbitrary dictum.

He pursues the same claptrap method in his next three heads respecting the conflagration, the new heavens, and the new earth. Not a shadow of anything like evidence is presented to support his views. He relies on nothing but groundless assumption, assertion, and false logic. He begins with the assumption, that the earth is to continue in its present state during the millennium. But that is a point in debate. To take it for granted, is in effect to beg the whole question. A fair disputant would not stoop to such an artifice; but it suits the genius and the principles of this critic, and enables him to talk with a lofty air of reducing his antagonists to "a dilemma;" as though, instead of *denying*, they *admitted* the point on which he proceeds in his conclusion! A rare feat, truly! Logicians have heretofore supposed, that an opponent could be reduced to a dilemma only by arguing from a point which he *admitted*. It was reserved to our reviewer to discover, that those whom he assails may be embarrassed in that manner as easily, by reasoning from a point which they *reject*, as from one which they maintain! For it is on that ground, that he flatters himself millenarians are reduced to a dilemma by his reasoning from the proposition, that the earth is to be the same in the millennial age as it is now;—which they deny.

Proceeding on this postulate, he next assumes, that at the conflagration, the earth will be absolutely burned up, and all its living inhabitants be destroyed, so that none will remain in the natural body, who can thereafter dwell on it. Of this also, which is a point in debate, he offers no proof. He argues from it, however, as though his opponents admitted it, and proclaims again, that they are reduced to a dilemma, by the consequence *he* draws from a proposition which they deny! "They are therefore in a third dilemma. They must either defer the conflagration till after the millennium, or render the earth an unfit abode for sinners in the flesh. If they defer the conflagration, they give up their whole argument for the pre-millennial advent. If they still insist on a pre-millennial conflagration, they must sacrifice their own high hopes, and the church's high hopes of the harvest of millennial converts." To what splendid results this method of arguing leads! The disputant has only to assume, that his opponent *admits* the identical points which he *denies*, and he is then reduced to the necessity of granting the logical consequences of those points, or else is convicted of self-contradiction! With what laurels ought he to be crowned who invented this efficacious method of dispatching an opponent! No one, however rightful the cause he advocates, or however adroit he may be in sustaining it, can extricate himself from the toils of such a "principle!" The peasant who assumed, that if the earth revolved on its axis, the line of gravity would continue the same, and the kettle of hasty pudding therefore, which hung over the fire at evening, would in the morning be found poured out of the top of the chimney, might by that expedient reduce the philosopher, who asserted that the earth turned over once in twenty-four hours, to a dilemma. He might say: If you assert that the earth turns as on an axis, then you imply, that the law of weight or gravity is completely reversed, when what is now the upper side of the globe passes to the under side. Otherwise, the mush hung at night over the fire would have fallen out of the chimney, when it was turned the lower end up; and all rivers, lakes, and the ocean itself, on this side the globe, would have fallen off into the vacant space below. If, on the other hand, you assert that the line of gravity is not reversed nor its force suspended,

then you oblige yourself to admit, that the earth does not turn on its axis, as otherwise the fluids on its surface could not retain their place.

This is precisely the process by which the reviewer reduces his opponents to a dilemma. By tacitly assuming that they agree with him in holding the identical propositions which they *deny*, he has them at once in a position in which he can gore them with the horns of his dilemma, as often, and as long as he pleases. His pompous arguments, expressed directly, are nothing more than the following, of which the premises are wholly false. Granting, as you do, our anti-millenarian doctrines, on the one hand, that the earth is, during the millennium, to be mainly what it now is; and that such an earth is wholly unfit for the residence of saints, in spiritual bodies; and on the other, that the earth is to be wholly burned up at Christ's coming, so that none of the human race in the natural body will survive on it; and that the new heavens and earth will be wholly unfit for the abode of men in the natural body; you make it impossible for yourselves, without the grossest self-confutation, to maintain that Christ's coming, the resurrection of the saints, the conflagration of the earth, and the creation of the new heavens and new earth, are to precede the millennium! It is on this miserable trick of exhibiting those whom he opposes, as assenting to his false and arbitrary assumptions, instead of holding their own views, that he builds almost the whole fabric of what he calls his argument.

He changes his method in his argument respecting the symbolical character of the Apocalypse, and proceeds on the false assumption, that there are no symbols except such as represent agents, acts, or events, of a different nature from themselves. Thus he says:—

"The symbolical character of the Apocalypse, and of the xxth chapter, is inconsistent with a *literal resurrection*, or a *literal reign* of Christ and the saints." "Mr. L. admits, that all the rest of the chapter is symbolical.... Everything ... except the resurrection, and the living and reigning, here mentioned. These are literal, while all the rest is allegorical.

"Will the reader mark the strange admission [in regard to the thousand years]—that, if one part of this description is not symbolic, no other part is; that if one part is symbolic, all the rest must be!

"And yet this is the very writer who makes the first resurrection here painted, instead of being symbolic, like the rest of the chapter, to be a literal rising of the bodies of the old saints, to live again on the earth, and be literal kings over men in the flesh, for a thousand years! Why not make them literal priests also? for they shall be priests of God, and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."—P. 36.

This reviewer is the most unfortunate blunderer that we have had occasion to criticise. Whether it be owing to sheer ignorance of the subject, heedlessness, prejudice, or the love of extravagance and contradiction, he cannot, it would seem, state a proposition on any subject without involving himself in inextricable difficulties, and demonstrating his total unfitness for the task he has undertaken. He here represents, that in our construction of the vision, Rev. xx. 4–6, we treat the resurrection and reigning of the saints as not symbolic; because we interpret them as denoting a real resurrection, and reigning of saints, like themselves; thus assuming, that to treat an agent, act, or event, as denoting an agent, act, or occurrence, identically like itself, is to treat it as though it were not a symbol. There is not a particle of ground, however, for this representation. We do not construe the rising and reigning of the saints in the vision, as he intimates, on a different principle from the rest of the vision. We interpret the whole as denoting agents, acts, and events of their own respective orders. The saints seen in the vision, represent the real saints who are to be raised at Christ's coming; their resurrection symbolizes the real resurrection of the saints at that epoch; the thrones on which they sat, symbolize the thrones on which the raised saints are then to be seated; their session on the thrones, and investiture with judicial power, denote the similar investiture and session of the saints; and the reigning of the representative souls with Christ, the similar reigning of the saints whom they symbolize. Thus we said, "The souls of the martyrs and others, were their souls by symbolization [that is, they were representative souls]; not their souls literally, inasmuch as many of them were not then in existence. They were exhibited in *their own persons*, not *by a symbol of a different species*, because no symbol of a different species could adequately

represent them." And so of the other parts of the vision. How now is it, that in the face of this fact, stated as clearly as language can express it, the reviewer ventures to represent, that we construe *the resurrection and reigning only*, not the other parts of the vision, as denoting events and acts like themselves?

On what ground, moreover, does he here assume, that agents and acts in the visions, that denote agents and acts of their own kind, are not used symbolically, or as *representatives* of real agents and acts? And how is it that he presumes to argue and declaim, as though it were so palpable, that we ourselves admitted it; aware as he is, that it is in direct contradiction to one of the leading laws we have stated of interpretation? And how, finally, is he to reconcile it with his own construction of the resurrection of the dead, Rev. xx. 12–15; which he expressly declares is a resurrection of the dead, not of the living, in order to their final judgment; and explains therefore, on the principle which he here disowns, that the dead, the resurrection, the standing before the throne, the throne itself, and the sentence, each represents its own order, or agents, objects, acts, or events of its own kind? And such is the mode, doubtless, in which he interprets many of the other symbols. As he holds, that the Judge in that vision appears in his own person, and represents himself as he is to be visibly present, and act in the final judgment of the dead, who are to be raised after the thousand years; so he doubtless holds, that God the Father appears as his own representative, in the visions of the fourth and fifth chapters; that the kings and their armies, under the sixth seal, symbolize kings and their armies of the same orders; that the men under the first vial, which had the mark of the beast, denote men of that class; and so of many others. The palpable mistakes, and glaring self-contradictions, however, into which he here falls, do not damp his self-confidence, or repress his dogmatism in the least. He exhibits the same self-complacent air, and announces his opinions in the same oracular tone, as in every other part of his essay.

He descants in the same manner on the order of the events foreshown in the closing chapters of the Apocalypse; but we must pass that, and also what he says of the transfiguration, and hasten to his peroration, in which he reaches the

climax of confusion and absurdity, in representing that "if the millenarian doctrine be true, it would present a most *melancholy prospect* compared with that which we now enjoy." The prospect which he and his party now enjoy, is that the world is to continue in essentially the same state as it now is, till the end of time; sin, misery and death prevailing, although "a vast majority" of its inhabitants will be sanctified. On the other hand, if millenarianism is true, the prospect is, that all nations are soon to be converted and freed from sin and its curse, want, toil, misery, and death; that Christ is to reign over them, with the risen saints, and bestow on them such gifts of the Spirit, as shall raise them to a majestic beauty of sanctitude, wisdom, and blessedness; and that after the last apostasy, death itself will be abolished, the race freed from the curse of the fall, and restored to the perfect image of God, will dwell here under Christ's rule, in holiness and bliss for ever.

Instead of this prospect, however, the reviewer has the audacity to represent, that "if the millenarian construction of the prophecies is true,"

"We are to expect a premature end of the world's probation, and give up all hopes of the salvation of the majority of the human family. For it is all but self-evident, that, when the Son of man comes in his glory to call the nations to his bar, as described Matt. xxv., the probation of the wicked is ended. When the conflagration comes, probation is ended. When the resurrection comes, and all the living saints are caught up into the air, probation is ended. When the new heavens and the new earth arise out of the fire, probation is ended, and the number of the saved is full. But millenarianism places each and all of these events before the millennium; of course shuts the door against all who are then in their sins.

"We say this is a melancholy prospect. We had looked forward to a future universal triumph of the gospel, to see the kingdom of the stone become the kingdom of the mountain, and fill the whole earth; to have the saints possess the kingdom under the whole heaven; to have wars cease, arts and sciences flourish, human life prolonged, the race immensely multiplied, and the number without number converted and saved during the long period of Messiah's triumph; to reduce to comparative insignificance the limited number of Satan's victims.

"Alas for all such hopes, if millenarianism be true!"—P. 40.

What now are we to think of the man who perpetrates this bold misrepresentation? Had he become so bewildered that he could not tell his own system from that which he assailed; or had his passions become so inflamed, that he cared not what he uttered, if he could but blacken his antagonists, and make their cause an object of hatred? It is scarcely credible that he was not conscious that the views which he represents as presenting such a melancholy prospect, are not the views of millenarians. They do not hold that the redemption of men is to cease at Christ's coming. That is the doctrine exclusively of *the reviewer and his party.* Millenarians maintain that the thousand years during which all nations are to be converted, and live under the reign of Christ and the saints, are to *follow* his advent, not precede it. It is the reviewer, and other antimillenarians, who hold the reverse, and believe that probation is to end at Christ's second coming; and of that this critic is perfectly aware. Yet in the face of this fact, he has the unparalleled injustice to assert that if millenarianism is true, there can be no general conversion of the nations, nor any millennium; but all hopes of the world must be abandoned: consequences that result exclusively from *his own theory* of the events that are to follow Christ's coming, and that are the exact converse of theirs! This is another specimen of the method in which he reduces his opponents to a dilemma, by ascribing to them his own false opinions which they expressly reject, and then charging on *their system* the fatal consequences which result exclusively from *his own!* Whether it is the effect of hallucination, a want of sense, or a want of principle, it is an outrage of which very few, even of the weak, the bewildered, or the reckless, are capable.

Such are the expedients which this writer employs to build up his own cause, and put down that which he assails. Not a topic has he touched but he has fallen into the grossest errors in regard to it. Not a shadow of anything like proof has he offered either to justify his own views, or confute theirs whom he attacks. He has nothing that deserves the name of reasoning. He builds what he denominates his "arguments" on the enormous injustice of falsely ascribing to those whom he opposes, his own mistaken opinions; and he relies throughout to ac-

complish his ends, on assumption, assertion, bravado, and clap-trap declamation. Such are not the instruments which the intelligent and upright are accustomed to choose to support the interests which they advocate. They are not the means that are best adapted to advance a *good* cause. Nor will they meet the approval of the considerate and upright of those for whom he writes. He has built his hope of success, not on their intelligence and candor, but on their prejudices. He has presumed on such a disposition in them to welcome the denunciation and ridicule of millenarianism, that he could lead them, by bold assertion and insolent abuse, into the belief of any misrepresentation which he chose to utter. He is himself under the sway of such false notions and exacerbated feelings, that he persuades himself that any expedient by which he can make those who hold that system the objects of contempt and reprobation, is legitimate; and he will, doubtless, succeed for the moment, with the ignorant, the weak, and the unscrupulous; but it will be but for a moment. His impudent pretexts and shallow deceptions will at length be seen through by all whose judgment is of any weight, and regarded with the scorn and pity which they deserve.

ART. VI.—THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or a Visit to a Religious Sceptic. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1858.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE rapid spread of late years of infidelity, and the conspicuity to which it has risen as a feature of the age, are to most very unexpected and startling events. The great exertions of the church to make known the gospel to the pagan nations, and the assurances uttered by almost the whole body of Christian teachers, that the conversion of the world by the instrumentality of Bibles and missionaries was soon to be accomplished, excited a belief among the religious generally, that deism and atheism, paganism, Mahometanism, and popery, were speedily to die out, and give place to the gospel.

In the very period, however, when this happy change was supposed to be taking place, infidelity has sprung up in a new form, and armed in a measure with new weapons, and entering the church itself as its principal theatre, has made conquests a hundred-fold more than sufficient to counterbalance the accessions to the ranks of the faithful that have been gained from the heathen. Nearly the whole Protestant population of Germany, France, Switzerland, and Denmark, had at the beginning of the present century fallen into a blank unbelief of the Scriptures; and during the last twenty-five years a crowd in Great Britain and this country have joined their train. Of this there have been two principal causes:—First, several of the natural sciences, especially geology, have been represented as contradicting the teachings of the Scriptures, and demonstrating that they are not inspired; and next, theories of the mind, and of the universe, have been put forth which deny that there are any evidences of the existence of God, declare that if he exists a revelation from him is impossible, and make man himself his own lawgiver, and the proper object of his religious homage. These systems, wrought into a specious form of philosophy, have captivated the young especially; have become the creed in a measure of a very considerable part of the educated throughout the Christian world; and have now many of their most zealous and effective teachers in the sacred profession.

The reasons for which these unbelievers reject the Christian system are not in all instances the same; nor are the views which they adopt in its place. Their discarding the Bible is not because they have found anything better to substitute in its place; nor because the theories they adopt instead of it are not obnoxious to a hundred fold more formidable objections. The grand reason of their disbelief lies in their alienation from God, their dislike of his government, and their desire to free themselves from the feeling of his dominion, and wish to make themselves their law. Their schemes of belief accordingly are as various as their differences are in mental power, culture, and opportunities to pursue their principles to their logical results. Some deny that the Scriptures are an inspired record of the Christian system, while they admit that Christianity itself is of Divine origin. Others deny the possibility even of a revelation, while a

third class admit that the sacred writers were indeed inspired, but hold that they were no more inspired than all other men are, especially when placed in exciting conditions, and are entitled to no more credence or authority than the pagan sages, philosophers, and poets of ancient times. Some simply reject the fact of a redemption by Christ; others deny the necessity and the possibility of a salvation by the sufferings or merits of a mediator. Not a few doubt the existence of the soul after death. Some who hold to its future existence maintain that it is entitled to be made happy on the ground of its character: while vast crowds of the most speculative and cultured absolutely deny by their theories the being of God, and of fellow creatures; or, admitting his existence, make him identical with men, or with the material and psychical universe.

It is the object of the author of The Eclipse of Faith to expose the falsehood and absurdity of these and other doctrines of their system. The work is in the form of a dialogue, and purports to be the substance of conversations between the author on the one hand, who maintains the truth of the Bible, and Harrington on the other, who is a universal sceptic, distrusting the principles of deism, material pantheism, and idealism, as absolutely as he distrusts the word of God; or between the latter, and Fellows, a disciple of Newman and Parker, who believes in what they call the absolute religion, and several others of different grades of error. It is written with candor, displays unusual acuteness, and shows up in a very effective manner the shallow fallacies, the false science, the pitiable delusions, and the daring impiety of the modern school of philosophers who "by wisdom know not God." We propose to notice some of their principal doctrines, point out the difficulties with which they are embarrassed, and give some of the arguments with which our author overthrows them.

I. Their most important dogma teaches that religion consists in a mere sense of "dependence on the Absolute," or God unrevealed, and a belief that he sympathizes with individual man; that these enter as essential elements into all the forms of religion; and thence that all the forms of religion, Gentile and Hebrew, Pagan, Mahometan, and Christian, are alike

true and acceptable to the Most High. This is asserted by one of their oracles in the following language:—

"There is a great advance from the Fetichism of the Canaanite to the pure theism of Moses; from the rude conceptions of the New Zealander, to the refined notions of an enlightened Christian. Ages of progress seem to separate them, so different is their theology. Yet the religion of each is the *same*, distinguished only by the more and less."

"There is no monopoly of religion by any nation or any age. Religion itself *is one and the same.* He that worships truly, by whatever form, worships *the only God. He* hears the prayer, whether called Brahma, Jehovah, Pan, or Lord; or called by no name at all. Each people has its prophets and its saints; and many a swarthy Indian, who bowed down to wood and stone; many a grim-faced Calmuck, who worshipped the great god of storms; many a Grecian peasant, who did homage to Phœbus Apollo when the sun rose or went down; yes, many a savage—his hand smeared all over with human sacrifice—shall come from the east and the west, and sit down in the kingdom of God with Moses and Zoroaster, with Socrates and Jesus."—*T. Parker's Discourses on Religion*, pp. 102–110.

And this results naturally from the other elements of their system. For if, as they unanimously hold, no specific revelation has been made by God respecting the worship that is to be offered him; if such a revelation is impossible; if religion is necessarily the product exclusively of the instinct, sentiment, and ideas of the individual mind that exercises it; if the ideas and sentiments of each individual respecting it are equivalent to an inspiration, and are an internal revelation of God's will; and if, especially, as the great authors and propagators of this scheme maintain, either God and the universe are the same, and man himself is God in his intelligent and conscious form; or God and the universe are but ideas; then it follows inevitably that the ideas and worship of each must to him be absolutely right and authoritative. If he be a creature, and yet his ideas and worship, though the offspring of his own mind, are a revelation of God's will, then they must of necessity be wholly acceptable to him. If, as the pantheist maintains, he is himself a part of God, then his ideas and acts of

worship must be the ideas and acts of God; and if, as the school of Hegel teaches, God himself and man are but ideas, without any external ground or being that corresponds to them, then, with equal certainty, the ideas of the Hottentot, the Hindoo, the Calmuck, the New Zealander, and the Christian, must undoubtedly stand on precisely the same level as to truth and authority.

Their definition of religion is framed also to suit this notion of God. If the only essential elements in religion are a sense of dependence on a superior being, and a belief that he sympathizes with individual men, then doubtless the forms in which that sense and belief are manifested or expressed—whether in those of the Egyptian, the Hindoo, the ancient Greek, the modern African, the Calmuck, the New Zealander, or the Christian—are of no significance, and must, if not altogether indifferent, be at least equally acceptable to God. This is, indeed, the lowest and most debased definition of religion that was ever excogitated by the darkened and perverted mind of man. It reduces it to a level with the sentiments and notions that are common to beasts that are familiar with men. The ox that knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib, have a sense of their dependence and a persuasion of their master's care over them; they submit to his will, and look to him for the supply of their wants: and if that is all that enters into the constitution of religion, then plainly religion is of no higher nature than the sense and belief that are common to brutes. Nevertheless, unspiritual and besotted as this definition is, it gives the essence of the religion of the whole tribe of the modern German infidel school, who, however they differ on other points, unite in exhibiting the notions, sentiments, and acts of men in respect to God, either as his direct acts, or as virtual inspirations and manifestations of his will. Yet their great boast of this religion is its spirituality! The grand excellence they claim that distinguishes it from that of the Bible is, that it transcends the sphere of sense, and concerns itself exclusively with the ideal and the absolute!

This definition, however, instead of giving, excludes all the true elements of a genuine religion. The mere sense or feeling that there is a God, and that he takes an interest in us, is not a religious regard. In order to a religious recog-

nition of God, he must be *acknowledged* as our maker and ruler, and *adored*, supplicated, trusted, and loved; if he is contemplated without any such recognition and homage, no religion is exercised towards him; and if, instead of being acknowledged in his peculiar relations, and honored and worshipped, his rights are denied, his rule impeached, and his character hated; then, in place of a religious, it is an irreligious agency toward him. Not a trace of real homage, not a shadow of genuine worship is embraced in the definition. It is transcendental indeed. It passes completely out of the sphere of the heart, of conscience, of the will; it excludes adoration, gratitude, truth, love, and confidence, and every form of worship, and sinks down into a bare notion of superiority and of interest, without consideration whether they are rightful or not; whether they are favorable or unfavorable to our well-being; and whether, therefore, they are to be contemplated with approbation and joy, or with aversion and terror. If, like Mr. Parker, they sometimes give it a wider scope, and exhibit it as embracing reverence, adoration, trust, and obedience, they then contradict their doctrine that religion in all its forms, and in all individuals, is in nature identically the same; since religions consisting of directly opposite affections, or the same generic affections exercised towards directly opposite objects, as the love of good and the love of evil, cannot be identically the same. If to escape this difficulty it be claimed that reverence, trust, adoration, are essential elements of religion, and that their religiousness lies altogether in their bare nature as reverence, love, trust, and adoration, without any consideration what the character of the being is towards whom they are exercised,—the equally embarrassing consequence then follows, that religion is wholly indifferent to the moral nature of the being or object towards which it is exercised; that if it involve a recognition of a superior being, and an exercise of awe, confidence, and homage, towards him, it is of no consideration whether he be holy or unholy, just and gracious, or unjust and malignant: which is to place good and evil, God and Satan, on a level with each other, and confound religion with impiety.

Their notion of religion denies, also, that God has any perfections, or sustains any relations that give him a real right

to the homage of men, and make it their duty to worship and obey him. For if he have such perfections and rights, it is plain that the homage of a wholly different being cannot, as they claim, be a genuine homage of him, and be accepted by him as such. "He that cometh unto God," must not only *come* to *him*, not depart from him and go to other beings real or imaginary, but he must come to him, "believing that he is" what he is, "and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek *him*," according to his perfections and the principles on which, as he has made known, he conducts the government of the world. To suppose it can be otherwise, is solecistical in the extreme; to hold that the worship of Baal or Moloch, Juggernaut or the Llama, is the worship of Jehovah, is in effect to hold that they are identically the same with him. To advance such a principle in any other sphere, would be regarded as a monstrous affront to common sense. What would be thought of a merchant who should claim that his simply paying away the sums that are due from him to his creditors, is all that is required to his discharging his debts to them, without any consideration whether it is to them, or other persons, that he gives the money? What judgment would be formed of a husband who should assert, that the duty to which he became obliged by the marriage vow, is simply that he should cohabit with some one of the other sex, without any regard to the question whether it is the person or not to whom he was married? In what estimate would a magistrate be held, who should maintain, that all that he is obliged to do by his office, is simply to cause as many individuals to be capitally punished as are sentenced by the courts to death, without any consideration whether they are the criminals who are adjudged to execution, or others, who have neither been condemned nor committed any offences against the law? But if the principle which these writers maintain is just in religion, why is it not equally legitimate in those other spheres of agency? If God has no rights that make it obligatory that the homage that is due to him should be actually paid *to him*, and to him exclusively; how, any more, can men have rights that make it necessary that money that is owed should be actually paid to the individuals to whom it is due, in order that the debt to them may be discharged; and that

the social and official acts of love, fidelity, truth, and justice, that are due to certain individuals in other spheres, should be exercised towards those identical individuals, in order that the several duties, of which they are the performance, may be fulfilled?

If men, moreover, may legitimately treat God in the manner which these speculatists allege, how can it be shown but that God may, with equal propriety, proceed on a similar principle in his administration of the world; and hold that it is to do all that his justice demands, to punish some of his creatures for the crimes that are perpetrated, without any consideration whether they are the persons who committed those crimes, or are the innocent; and that he does all that his sanctitude and goodness demand, if he shows favor to others of his creatures, without any regard to the question whether they are his obedient children or his enemies? If these boasting philosophers can prove that God is bound to receive, or may receive any homage that is offered by men, and offered to any being or thing whatever, senseless matter, animals, men, demons, or angels, as a true and proper homage offered to him;—how can they show that any course of agency which God may be supposed to pursue towards other creatures, may not be a perfect performance of all that is due from him to them, although it may be in total contradiction to their characters, involve the utmost violation of right, and leave them without any provision for their well-being? On what ground can they assume that God is bound to act towards men, in one of the relations which they sustain—that of creatures who owe him homage—on a totally different principle from that on which he must act towards them in another—that of beings who are to receive from him rewards that correspond to their character?

The very first step of these rejecters of the Bible, in the construction of a new religion, thus is, to assume that God has neither any perfections, nor any rights, that make it the duty of men to acknowledge, adore, and love him, rather than anything else; they place evil and good, wrong and right, on the same level; they deny that there is any such thing as justice or injustice, truth or falsehood, and thereby make it altogether impossible to exercise a religion of rightful acts of acknowledgment, and holy affections! And having

thus obliterated the grounds on which the government of God and the obligations of men rest; having extinguished the last ray of light, and reduced the universe to a chaos of darkness, they proceed to construct a religion that is suited to their principles and tastes, and reflects their moral image: a religion, in which the hideous features of folly and impiety are presented in their most monstrous dimensions. Yet this wretched drivel is the sum and substance of what they call spiritual religion and transcendental theology, the work of "internal revelation" and "insight," and hold, is to free the world from its errors, and raise it from its debasement and misery! There is no characteristic of modern scepticism more inbred and conspicuous, than its bald senselessness, and contradiction to reason.

II. The next dogma of their sceptical system is a denial of the possibility of what they denominate "a book revelation;" the imposition by God of laws and communication of instruction through ministers chosen for the purpose, in language that may be recorded by them in a book, and remain an authoritative rule of faith and action to men, as the Sacred Scriptures purport to be. This is one of the weakest and silliest of the pretexts to which the assailants of the Bible resort to divest it of its character as the word of God, and induce men to doubt and disown it, and indicates an extreme dearth of legitimate means of confuting its claims to be a divine revelation. They do not deny that any facts, truths, laws, promises, or purposes, that may be supposed to be communicated by God to a prophet or prophets, may be written on parchment or paper, or graven on stone or metal, and in language as intelligible as that of the ordinary speech in which men express their thoughts, affections, and purposes to each other, and may thereby be preserved and made known to individuals, families, communities, and nations, from generation to generation; for men record in that manner their thoughts, their purposes, and their achievements, and transmit thereby a knowledge of them to thousands and millions of persons with whom they have no other media of communication, and many of whom do not exist, till long after they have passed from life: and these sceptics themselves choose books in preference to all other means of making known their sentiments and beliefs to their fellow-men.

As, then, the possibility of the record of a revelation in a book, on the supposition that one is made, cannot be denied; they must found their denial of the possibility of a book revelation on a denial that God can make a communication of facts, truths, laws, and purposes to men, that can be written as a revelation from him. But that is absurd. It is to represent God as having less power to make known his thoughts to his creatures, than they have to communicate theirs to one another. It is to represent that he who contrived and upholds our nature is unable, with all his infinite attributes, to produce effects in us which lie completely within the scope of our faculties, and are the media of all our interchange of thought and feeling, of all our expressions of desire and purpose. Will any man of sense utter such a monstrous absurdity? He that created our corporeal and spiritual nature, cannot he act on it, if he please, in such a manner as to transfuse into us his thoughts, as effectually as we can act upon one another? Having himself, in the form of the Eternal Word, assumed our very nature, cannot he reveal himself visibly to us, if he choose, that we may see him, as distinctly as we see our fellow-men, and know as certainly that a communication made to us proceeds from him, as we know that those that are made to us by men proceed from them? Cannot he speak to us through that nature, as audibly and as intelligibly as we can speak to one another, and give us as absolute a certainty that what we hear comes from him? It is absurd to deny it, and these men would be incapable of such folly were they not devoid of all proper ideas of God. It is equivalent moreover to a denial that he can make an "*interior*" revelation to individuals of his thoughts and will in respect to them. For if he cannot make known to an individual certain thoughts, enactments, and predictions, and that they are a revelation to be communicated to others, how can it be maintained that certain thoughts, commands, and predictions can be communicated to an individual with an assurance that they are a revelation from God to him? The real doctrine accordingly of these writers is, that no revelation, properly speaking, is made by God to men; no communication that differs in any sense from their ordinary train of sensation, perception, thought, and feeling, that is excited by the action

of external agents, and the natural movement of their nature under such impressions. Their doctrine that a book revelation is impossible, is, in fact, borrowed from the pantheists of Germany—from whom these writers drew most of their creed;—who, holding that each individual is God in a human form, and thence that all the thoughts, affections, and wishes of each individual, are the thoughts and acts of God, maintain that no individual's thoughts and sentiments can be any more divine or a revelation than another's, and hold, therefore, that the supposition of a special revelation to the race generally, through a few individuals, to be recorded in a book, and have the authority of a rule of faith and action to all others, above their own thoughts and beliefs, is a self-contradiction. But, however naturally it may follow from their theory of God and man, it cannot be held with any show of reason by those who, like these writers, profess not to adopt that pantheistic system.

The senselessness and inconsistency of their notions are well shown by our author in the following dialogue between Harrington, the absolute sceptic, and Fellows, the disciple of Newman:

"*H.* Mr. Newman affirms, you say, that in his judgment every book revelation is an absurdity and a contradiction; or, in the words quoted by you, impossible? *F.* Yes, of moral and spiritual truth. *H.* And of any other truth—as of historical truth; you say such revelation is unnecessary? *F.* Yes. *H.* And moreover, as you and Mr. Newman affirm, the bulk of mankind are not competent to investigate the claims of such an historic investigation? *F.* Certainly. *H.* And, therefore, it is impossible *in fact*, if not *per se*, unless God is to be supposed doing something both unnecessary and futile? *F.* I think so, of course. *H.* So that all book revelation is impossible? *F.* I affirm it. *H.* Very well; I do not dispute it. There still remain one or two difficulties on which I should like to have your judgment towards forming an opinion; and they are on the very threshold of the subject. And first, I suppose you do not mean to restrict your term, a book revelation, to that only which is literally consigned to a book in our modern sense. You mean an *external* revelation? *F.* Certainly. *H.* If, for example, you could recover a genuine manuscript of Isaiah or Paul, you would not think it entitled to any more respect as *authority*, than a modern translation in a printed book—though it might be free from some errors? *F.* I should not...

H. And for a similar reason, surely, you would reject at once the *oral* teaching of any such man as Paul, or Matthew, or anybody else, if he professed that what he said was dictated by divine inspiration concurrently or not with the use of his own faculties? You would repudiate at once his claims, however authenticated, to be your infallible guide; to tell you what you are to believe, and how you are to act? For, surely, you will not pretend that there is any difference between statements which are merely expressed by the living voice, and those same statements as consigned to a book; except that if any difference be supposed at all, one would, for some reasons, rather have them in the last shape, than in the first. *F.* Of course there is no difference. To object to a book revelation, and grant a 'lip revelation' from God, or to deny that 'lip revelation,' when it is made permanent and diffusible, the authority it had when first given, would be a childish hatred of a book indeed. *H.* I perfectly agree with you. I understand you then to deny that any revelation professedly given to you or to me, has, or *can* come to us through any external channel, printed, or on parchment, ancient or modern, by the living voice, or in a written character; and that this is a proper translation, in a generalized form, of the phrase 'a book revelation.' *F.* I admit it. *H.* And you would of course reject any such revelation coming from any external source, even though the party proclaiming it confirmed it by miracles? .... *F.* I should say that upon the principles on which Mr. Newman has argued the question, all revelation, except that which is internal, is impossible. I should not believe the supposed envoy's claims. *H.* Whatever the number or splendor of his miracles? *F.* Certainly. *H.* Very well; that is what I call a plain answer to a plain question. I fancy that I should believe the man's claims. I should be even greatly tempted to think that those things which I could not entirely see *ought* to be contained in the said revelation, were to be believed. But to dismiss that; you have agreed that a book revelation is impossible, and not to be believed, even if avouched by miracles. *Have men in general* been disposed to believe a book revelation impossible? if not, I am afraid they would be very liable to fall into erro share in my weaknesses. *F.* Liable to run into error? been perpetually running into this very error, always, a *H.* If it is true as you say, that man has always man able facility of falling into this error, m ny will h that the thing is not so plainly impos men in general should believe things impossible. However, you admit it for I cannot honestly deny it: b

confounded what is historical or intellectual with moral and spiritual truth. *H.* I am afraid that will not excuse their absurdity, because, as you admit, *all* book revelation is impossible. But further, supposing men to have made this strange blunder, it only shows that the 'moral and spiritual' could not be very clearly revealed *within;* and no wonder men began to think that perhaps it might come to them from without! When men begin to mistake blue for red, and square for round, and chaff for wheat, I think it is high time that they repair to a doctor *outside* them, to tell them what is the matter with their poor brains. *F.* Certainly. *H.* But men, however, have somehow perversely believed it very possible, and that in some shape or other it has been given. *F.* They have, I must admit. *H.* Unhappy race! thus led on by some fatality, *though not by the constitution of their nature*, rather by some inevitable perversion of it, to believe as possible what is so plainly impossible. Oh, that it did not involve a contradiction, to wish that God would relieve them from such universal and pernicious delusions, by giving them a book revelation, *to show them that all* book revelations are impossible! *F.* That would indeed be a novelty. Miracles would hardly prove that. *H.* I think not. But as the poet says, 'Some good or friendly man' may show the way. Pray permit me to ask, did *you* always believe that a book revelation was impossible! *F.* How can you ask the question? You know that I was brought up like yourself, in the reception of the Bible as the only and infallible revelation of God to mankind. *H.* To what do you owe your emancipation from this grievous and universal error, which still infects, in this, or some other shape, the myriads of the human race? *F.* I think principally to the work of Mr. Newman, on the 'Soul,' and his 'Phases of Faith.' *H.* *These have been to you then, at least, a* HUMAN *book revelation, that a* DIVINE *book revelation is impossible*, a truth which I acknowledge you could not have [illegible] book [illegible]tion, without a contradiction. You ought [illegible] of Mr. Newman [illegible] well when [illegible] man can: [illegible] consider [illegible] his perni- [illegible] would have [illegible] that man [illegible] a divine [illegible] of Mr. [illegible]

highest value; it is such, that it might not appear unworthy of celestial origin, if it did not imply a contradiction, that God should reveal to us in a *book*, that a revelation in a *book* is impossible."—Pp. 73–82.

He confirms this argument by a variety of other exemplifications; and shows at every step, that while these philosophic sceptics deny to God the power of making known his will to men by a book—they are themselves accustomed to resort to books for knowledge on all subjects respecting which they wish to be informed, and actually draw their most important religious doctrines from volumes that are written and published by their fellow men. How is this most absurd self-contradiction to be accounted for? Partly by their utter want of all proper ideas of God; their having lost themselves in the bewildering mazes of the pantheists, from whom they drew their sceptical system, and their having slid, perhaps in a measure unconsciously, into the idea that they are themselves at least equal to, or like God; that their reason is divine reason; that no will or judgment, therefore, can be of higher authority than theirs; and partly also, from a wish, through a hatred of the Bible, to put it down at all hazards, and the feeling that they have no other means so efficacious for the purpose as to make it the object of contempt and ridicule by exhibiting it as a contradiction to the nature both of God and man; a monstrosity so palpable and enormous as to make belief in it discreditable.

III. Their third principal doctrine is, that on the supposition that a revelation were made, it could not be proved by miracles to be a revelation, inasmuch as miracles are impossible. This is as reasonless and absurd as the other, and is refuted at large by our author. As, however, it would require too much space to give his argument at length, we shall content ourselves with briefly indicating the groundlessness of their dogma.

On what rational plea then can it be held, that if God make a revelation, it is impossible that he should work miracles to demonstrate that it is from him? Not on the pretext, surely, that he cannot work miracles. It is folly to assert, that he who created and upholds all things, and directs all their operations, is not able to alter, at his will, their nature or condition, in any of the forms that are termed miraculous, or give birth to any other effects, however vast or wonderful they might be. It is to deny that the continued exist-

ence, and the mode of being or condition of his works, depend on him. It is to imply, that they have become self-existent, and that he has lost his dominion over them, and his omnipotence. For how else could it become impossible to him to raise the dead to life, or restore the diseased organs of the blind, the deaf, and the dumb, to health?

It is equally senseless and absurd to pretend that he cannot work miracles that should be seen and felt with the utmost conviction by men to be the product directly of his omnipotent hand. Great efforts have been made by Hume and other sceptics to prove that no events, however peculiar and stupendous, that might be wrought immediately by the hand of God, could possibly be known by men to be miraculous. No pretence, however, was ever more false. A miracle is an effect produced by the direct act of God, that transcends the power of second causes, and accordingly never takes place in connexion with their agency. Such effects are the resurrection of the dead to life, the restoration of the sick to health by a word, and the gift of sight to the blind. They are changes a mere human volition has no power to produce. This is so manifest, that a volition to produce them, except with a conviction that it was to be verified by Almighty power, would be universally regarded as indicative of insanity. The resurrection of the dead never takes place from the action of second causes. So far from it, the state of death itself is the effect of second causes, and causes that are not subject, after they have accomplished their work, to any counteractive forces. There is nothing in the sphere of nature that has any power or tendency to restore a dead body to life. As long as it remains in that domain, it must of necessity continue in the state of death. A resurrection at the word of a messenger from God, carries with it, therefore, a resistless demonstration that it is the work of his omnipotent will; and such it has ever been felt to be by those who have witnessed it, and would be by these sceptics themselves were they to behold such a spectacle. Had Hume and Gibbon stood by the grave of one who they knew had, like Lazarus, been several days dead, and seen him come forth in full life and energy at the command of a prophet, they would have been penetrated with a resistless conviction, notwithstanding their philosophy, that it was the work

of the Almighty. To suppose it could have been otherwise, is to suppose that they were completely hallucinated. If they could in the possession of their senses have eluded the conviction that it was a miracle, it would have been by persuading themselves, by some sophistical process, that it was not a real resurrection from *death;* but from a mere state of suspended animation, or a swoon. Assured that it was *a resurrection*, and they would have been equally assured that it was a miracle. There is no difficulty, then, in knowing with the utmost certainty that such events are miraculous. Their nature demonstrates that that is their character. If the beholder were to mistake, it would be in misjudging of the nature of the event; in deeming a change to be a resurrection which was, in fact, only a revival from apparent death. If absolutely sure that the body which was revived, was previously devoid of life, and in a state of decay; and that the state to which it was changed was that of real life; he would then have as perfect a certainty that it was produced by a direct divine interposition, as he would that the change itself from death to life had taken place.

There is no difficulty, then, whatever in knowing that such events are really miraculous. The only danger of error lies in judging of the state of the bodies that are the subjects of the changes, immediately previous to their taking place, and there is no room for error there in cases like those of the miracles wrought by Christ and the apostles. There is no difficulty in knowing with certainty that bodies that have long been dead, are actually dead; nor that persons who have for years been blind, dumb, or halt, are actually so. The pretext of these sceptics in regard to which they have clamored so long and so loud, stripped of the mist of words in which it is enveloped, is nothing else than the pretence that it is impossible to distinguish with absolute certainty between the blind and those who have the power of sight, between the dumb and those who have the gift of speech, and between the dead and the living.

It is in like manner unjustifiable and absurd to maintain, that if miracles are wrought, they still are no proof that the persons with whose agency they are connected are the ministers of God, and their teachings of divine authority. For that is to represent God either as interposing and working

miracles without any intelligible reason, or else as giving his sanction to the claims and teachings of men that are not his true ministers; which is to contradict his perfections. It is vain, then, to deny that miracles may be wrought; that they may be known to be miracles; and that they prove that those with whose ministry they are connected are teachers sent from God. This is confirmed accordingly by the general judgment of mankind. With the exception of a few captious sceptics, men universally have believed miracles both to be possible and to have been wrought; and whenever they have been performed, they have been regarded as indubitable proofs of the divinity of the doctrines which they were employed to sanction; and such would be their effect now. Were ministers teaching the very doctrines of the gospel, which these writers most passionately reject, now to heal the sick, give sight to the blind, and raise the dead, the most sceptical of these doubters would be forced to feel and admit that those teachers were indubitably the ministers of God, however much they might hate them and revolt from their doctrines.

Having thus shown to their satisfaction that all religions stand on essentially the same level as to authority; that external or book revelations are impossible; and that if they are supposed to be made, they cannot be verified by miracles; these sceptics next proceed to disprove the claims of the Bible to be received as a revelation, by endeavoring to convict it of defects, mistakes of fact, and errors of principle, that in their judgment show that it cannot have proceeded from God. This subject is treated less fully than the other themes by our author. He shows, however, that the main grounds on which they proceed, and their favorite objections are those of the English deists, which have often been answered. Such is eminently the fact with Mr. Newman, in his Phases of Faith, in which he gives the history of his apostasy from belief in the word of God to the lowest form of scepticism. A more pitiable display of pretentious sciolism, pert captiousness, and reasonless and preposterous unbelief, we have seldom seen. With a good deal of quickness and smartness, and a smattering of knowledge on many subjects, he is yet master of none. He is not a theologian, a critic, nor even an adroit sophist; while he is of a tempera-

ment that exposes him peculiarly to be carried away by impulses, and become the dupe of false notions and shallow logic—having a morbid and almost passionate sensibility to objections, however slight, to facts or doctrines which he dislikes; and an equal indisposition or inability to see and appreciate objections, however obvious and formidable they may be, to principles and doctrines which fall in with his tastes and prepossessions. An objection, whether with or without weight, that chimes in with his mood at the moment, instantly divests the most indubitable fact, and most indisputable truth, of all title to belief; while the consideration that the rejection of such a fact or truth is embarrassed by a thousand times more serious difficulties, has no influence to restrain him from discarding it. He cannot believe a proposition that interferes in any measure with his "sentiments," as long as a single point of the subject to which it relates lies out of his vision, or seems involved in any mystery; while he can disbelieve propositions that do not fall in with his "sentiments," though they are sustained by the most ample and indubitable evidence. And the reason of it, it is very apparent, is, that he makes his own peculiar notions and impulses the standard of his judgment. Instead of judging of the acts ascribed to God in the Bible, by the infinite nature, the distinguishing relations, and the peculiar rights of the Most High, he forms his estimate of them from himself, and thinks that whatever could not be wise and good, and just for him in his sphere, cannot be just and wise for God in his. This he openly avows; and he accordingly holds that the command to Abraham to slay his son cannot have proceeded from God, because it would have been a crime in Abraham to have sacrificed Isaac *without* such a command. "If the voice of morality is allowed to be heard," he says, "Abraham was in heart and intention, though not in actual performance, not less guilty than those who sacrificed their children to Moloch." He supposes, therefore, that the command of God could have made no difference to Abraham in regard to the morality of that act; but because it would be a crime in him to sacrifice a son without a divine command, and against the great law, "Thou shalt not kill," he assumes that it would be an equal crime though he were directed to do it by the Most High. He has thus no idea that God's

perfections and station give him any rights over his creatures that he himself does not possess over his family and friends. He has no conception that God might, without a violation of justice, have taken away the life of Isaac, and in any way that he pleased; nor any suspicion that Abraham might have obeyed the command in pure submission to the divine rights, without any interception of his benevolent feelings towards his son, and with an unfaltering trust that God would still verify his promise to him of life and a posterity, and make the event issue by a restoration to life, in the advancement of his well-being. Was there ever a more extraordinary blunder? Did ever a mortal exhibit greater infatuation than thus to reduce the Almighty to a level with himself, and because he has no right to take the life of his children, who have not committed any capital offence against him, claim that God has no right to take the life of his creatures though they have incurred the penalty of death by transgressing his laws? On the principle on which he proceeds, God would be as wholly unjustifiable in inflicting death on men, and in punishing them in the invisible world, as Mr. Newman himself would be in putting all who come within his reach to death, and consigning them, if in his power, to punishment in the future life! This he holds to be so certain, that no *conceivable* miracle would justify him in believing that God had commanded him to exert an act which, independently of the command, he had no right to exert. "Would any conceivable miracle," he asks, "justify me in slaying my wife? God forbid! It *must* be naturally right to believe *moral* rather than *sensible* perceptions. No outward impressions on the eye or ear can be so valid an assurance to me of God's will, as my inward judgment. How amazing, then, that Paul and James could look on Abraham's intention to slay his son, as indicating a praiseworthy faith!" It is so absolutely inconsistent, therefore, he holds, for God to command one human being to take the life of another, that no miracle, no method he could employ of expressing such a command, would be entitled to be regarded as indicating that it was his will. No infliction of death, then, upon public criminals can be considered as having the sanction of divine authority. So far from it, the executioners of murderers and other offenders must themselves

be considered as guilty of murder in a most aggravated form! What a far-seeing philosophy! What a fine specimen of the superiority of his religion of insight to that of revelation! He does not see that in endeavoring to convict the Bible in this instance of a violation of morality, he brings identically the same charge against God for every infliction of death on a human being that takes place under his providence. For if God cannot, without a breach of morality, employ the ministry of man in inflicting death, how can he any more, without an equal violation of right, use any other instrument for the purpose?

He objects on the same ground to the extermination of the Canaanites by Joshua. Because it would be an atrocious act in him to slaughter individuals and families who had committed no offence against him, not only without, but against the divine command, he maintains that it was equally atrocious in Joshua and his troops to slaughter the inhabitants of Canaan *by* the divine command. A plain denial that God can give authority to his creatures and make it their duty to do anything which they might not rightfully do independently of his command; which is to deny the possibility of a rightful divine or human government; inasmuch as all the authority of human rulers must be communicated either by God or men; and a virtual denial also that God has any right to take the life even of transgressors; and implying, therefore, that if he gives existence to creatures like men, he is bound, notwithstanding they may revolt, to continue them for ever in life: which is equivalent to a denial that he has any right to punish them for their offences: for why, if he may justly punish them in any form, may he not punish them, as he does now, with death: and if he may punish with death, why may he not, as he does, employ the ministry of men and angels in inflicting it? Such are the results to which these attempts of Mr. Newman to impeach the morality of the Bible lead. Of the lowest grade of Hottentots, there probably is not one in a million so stupid as to be capable of such errors.

He alleges also what he deems errors of fact, which he regards as demonstrating that the writers in whose narratives they occur, cannot have been inspired. Like Strauss he assumes that the worst possible constructions are to be placed

on all such passages, and that no explanation of the errors or inconsistencies which they seem to involve, however plausible and probable, are to be accepted as of any value. Among these, the differences of the genealogies of Christ in Matthew, Luke, and Chronicles, seem to be regarded by him as quite decisive. That there is no pretence that any names are inserted in either of the lists that did not belong to the line of his ancestors either by Joseph or Mary; that the omission of several names in Matthew's list may have been in perfect consistency with the customs of the Israelites in making their genealogical lines; that the fact that Luke's list gives the line of Mary, explains its chief differences from that of Matthew; and that some that are not thus accounted for, may have originated in the carelessness of transcribers, has not the weight of a feather with him. While, on the other hand, he wholly disregards the infinitely greater difficulties in which he involves himself, by assuming on such grounds, that the whole Bible is the work of uninspired men; a supposition that is in the greatest possible contradiction to our nature, and makes the existence of that book immeasurably more inexplicable than the mysteries and miracles are which it records. No greater impossibility can be imagined, than that uninspired men should have conceived and drawn such characters as are ascribed in the Bible to God and to Christ, or should have painted such a moral government as that which is there represented as exercised by the Most High.

Other objections are founded on the grossest blunders and misrepresentations. Thus, he charges the apostle John with holding a most "degrading view of the matrimonial relation," because, "in one of his visions, he exhibits 144,000 chosen saints, perpetual attendants of the Lamb, and places the cardinal point of their sanctity in the fact that they were not defiled with women, but were virgins. *Marriage,* therefore," he says, "is defilement. Protestant writers struggle in vain against the obvious meaning of the passage." .... Mr. Newman does not know, it seems, that God expressly instituted marriage, pronounces it honorable in all, and prohibits the violation of its laws as one of the greatest crimes. He does not know that it is by adultery and fornication alone that, according to the Bible, men defile themselves with women: and that the representation, therefore, that the 144,000 were

not defiled, but were pure, is simply equivalent to stating that they had not been guilty of associating with women *in violation of the divine law;* or, if he knew it, he overlooks it, and in his eagerness to find an objection to the Sacred Word, is guilty of the very outrage which he falsely charges on John, by assuming that marriage *is* as defiling as adultery, and maintaining on that ground that John's representation that the 144,000 servants of God were not defiled, was a representation that they had not been married! What a masterly critic!

Such are the main doctrines of this sceptical school, and the grounds on which they reject the word of God. Nothing can be more apparent than that their principles are false, and that their hostility to the Bible springs from their dislike of the character which it ascribes to the Most High, the government it exhibits him as exercising, and especially the method of redemption it reveals through the mediation of Christ. It is because of the deep and rancorous aversion with which they regard these, that they resort to such violent and preposterous methods to wrest from it its title to be received as a divine revelation. Notwithstanding their boast of a direct insight of the Almighty, their claims to a lofty spirituality, and their pretence even that they are inspired, at least as much as the prophets and apostles can have been, they exhibit the most indubitable proof that they are totally ignorant of the majesty of God; that they have changed his glory into the likeness of corruptible man; that they are eminently devoid of the sense of the morally great and beautiful; that they are strangers, therefore, to the reverence and awe which strong minds even that are unsanctified often exhibit; and that their very religion is the work of narrow-mindedness, pride, audacity, and lawlessness.

The rapidity with which their dogmas are spreading, and the extraordinary facility with which the young especially are led to adopt them, form one of the darkest features of the age; and unless the friends of truth, and particularly the ministers of the gospel, cease to give their sanction to the writers whose metaphysics form the ground on which the system is erected, and bestir themselves to check its progress, it will, ere they are aware, diffuse its deadly canker, as it has in Germany and France, through the whole mass of the community.

ART. VII.—THE REVIVAL OF THE FRENCH EMPERORSHIP ANTICIPATED, FROM THE NECESSITY OF PROPHECY, BY G. S. FABER, B. D., Master of Sherburn Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury. London: 1853.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE author's object in this little volume is to remind his readers that he anticipated many years ago, in his Calendar of Prophecy, such a revival of the French Empire as has recently taken place, and to show that it confirms the interpretation he put in that work on the seven heads of the wild beast, Rev. xiii. and xvii. His theory of that symbol is, that the sixth, or imperial head, which was reigning at the date of the vision, continued down to the year 1806, and represented, after the fall of Augustulus, the succession on the throne of Constantinople, till the time of Charlemagne; from that epoch, the head also of the French and the German empire, which was styled the Roman, down to the fall of Constantinople in 1453; and from that period, the succession on the throne of Austria till 1806, when Francis, who then held the imperial sceptre, relinquished it in consequence of the dismemberment of the empire by the formation of the confederation of the Rhine. The seventh head, he holds, then entered on its career in the person of Napoleon, emperor of France. The fall and abdication of that personage in 1815, he interprets, as the event denoted by the deadly wound inflicted on one of the heads of the beast; and as that deadly wound was healed, he thence inferred, that the French empire would be revived after a short period, either in a person of the Bonaparte family, or some other adventurer, and would verify the predictions respecting the beast which still remain to be accomplished. This construction is put forth with the utmost assurance of its accuracy; a variety of arguments drawn from the prophecy are employed to sustain it; and the fact that Louis Napoleon has lately recalled the French empire into existence, and now wields its sceptre, is regarded as a resistless demonstration of its truth.

The question whether it be such or not, is one of some moment, from the principles of interpretation on which it is founded, and from its bearing on other predictions of the

Apocalypse. If the principles on which Mr. Faber proceeds, are admissible, it would seem scarcely worth while to attempt an exposition of the prophecy, by any other means than bold assumption and conjecture. There is scarce a construction that has ever been framed of any of its symbols, that has not as numerous and plausible reasons for its support. Those principles are, however, we believe, altogether mistaken, and the construction which he founds on them, if admitted, so far from harmonizing the prophecy at large, contradicts many of its predictions, and leaves a number of the most momentous events that are foreshown in it—such as a general persecution, the slaughter and resurrection of the witnesses, the sealing of the servants of God—altogether without accomplishment. For he looks for none of those events, but only for "a grand conspiracy," under the auspices of the French emperor, "against the truth of the pure gospel;" "a fearful war of *opinion* for the purpose of suppressing it;" the infliction of judgments on the nations of Europe; and the final fall of the wild beast and Roman prophet in Palestine; and all these events he thinks are to be comprised in the next twelve or thirteen years. We shall state, therefore, what seem to us unanswerable objections to his view of the beast.

In the first place, he assumes that the powers denoted by the sixth and seventh heads of the beast, were to exercise the supreme rule of the empire, during the whole career of that symbol, from its emergence from the sea to its final destruction. That, however, is not only without authority, but is against an express symbolization on its ascent from the sea, that the sovereignty was to pass, on the fall of Augustulus, from the emperors to the kings of the ten kingdoms; for the diadems which the dragon bore on its seven heads were changed on the beast from the heads to the horns; which implies a corresponding change of the supreme power, denoted by the diadems. It is in direct contradiction, therefore, to that symbol, to suppose that after the rise of the kings, whom the horns represent, the supreme power of the western empire, over which they reigned, was exercised—not by them—but by a wholly different line, to which they were subordinate. As the presence of the diadems on the heads of the dragon, not on its horns, shows that the heads re to exercise the supreme sway through the whole period

of the dragon rule over the western empire, which was subsequently to be the theatre of the horns; so on the other hand, the presence of the diadems on the *horns* of the wild-beast, and not on its heads, shows as clearly that the rule of the heads was to reach its end, before the horns entered on their empire; and that after they rose to power, they were alone to exert the supreme rule in their scene, the western empire, and that the seventh head, therefore, must have fallen, at the fall of Augustulus, when the old Roman or dragon empire expired in the west, and its whole territory and population became subject to the ten Gothic kings. And this is confirmed by the fact, that no Roman emperor, nor any exercising a sway resembling that of the old Roman imperial rule, ever thereafter reigned over the western Roman empire. Charlemagne was a mere king of one of the kingdoms, and was represented by one of the horns, not a monarch of the whole western empire, exerting a power over it, answering to that exerted by a head of the beast. He did not inherit his dominion from the old empire, but acquired it by his sword. He did not inherit his title as emperor, therefore; instead, it was conferred on him, and perhaps at his command, by the pope, who had no power whatever to reproduce the ancient empire, or invest him with the authority which its fallen emperors had possessed; and Charlemagne accordingly, and his line, had no more authority over England, Scotland, Ireland, Spain, Portugal, Northern Africa, Southern Italy, Eastern Germany, than the princes of those countries had over him or his successors. The emperors of Germany, in like manner, were mere emperors of their own kingdom, which was but one of the eight or ten into which the western empire was divided, and were represented accordingly by one of the horns, not by a head of the beast. They had no more authority over France, England, Scotland, Ireland, Spain, except under Charles V. Portugal and Southern Italy, than the kings of those realms had over them, and had no higher title to be considered as continuing the ancient Roman imperial rule.

That the rule of the heads in the western empire terminated with the fall of Augustulus, when the ten horns rose to supreme power, is confirmed also by the fact that the line of Christian emperors to which Augustulus belonged, was

symbolized the imperial line at Constantinople, whose sphere of action was, with the exception of a few years, exclusively the eastern empire? He admits also that it is a violation of "zoological propriety if we make the same power in the same capacity and under the same aspect, to be at once both a head and a horn."—*S. Cal.* vol. ii. p. 47. How then can he maintain that the kings of France and of Austria, who he holds are at periods represented by horns, at other periods are the powers that are symbolized by the sixth and seventh heads? The mere fact that changes took place in their titles and the extent of their territories, could not change them from horns to heads. Equal changes took place in the titles and territories of the kings of England. They for a long period held possession of a large province of France. They had for several generations a kingdom in Germany. They have for several centuries held the sceptre of Ireland and Scotland. But they have not by that means become heads of the western Roman empire; nor any more did the monarchs of Germany and France by mere changes of their titles, or augmentations of their territory.

In the next place, aside from these considerations, he fails, even on his own "principles," to furnish any proof that the French emperor Napoleon was the power denoted by the beast's seventh head.

1. On the supposition that the emperors of France of the ninth century and of Germany from the ninth to the nineteenth, were the powers denoted by the sixth head, it would follow, on the views Mr. F. maintains, that the French emperor of 1806 was a *continuance* of the power symbolized by that head, not a distinct line of which the seventh head was the symbol. For he assumes that the loss of the imperial sceptre by the successors of Charlemagne in the ninth century, and its assumption by the monarchs of Germany, did not involve the fall of the sixth head—by which he holds the French line of emperors was represented—and the rise of another head as the symbol of the German line. Why then should he any more assume that the sixth head fell and the seventh arose, at the assumption of the imperial sceptre in 1804 by the monarch of France, and the relinquishment of it in 1806 by the house of Austria? The change of the seat of empire, the territory, or the principles of administration,

was no greater in the latter instance, than it was in the former. To be consistent Mr. F. should maintain that the sixth head of the beast fell on the fall of the line of Charlemagne in the ninth century, that the seventh head of the beast rose into power with the imperial line of Germany which succeeded his; and therefore that that head fell on the abdication of the title of emperor by Francis of Austria in 1806, and that an *eighth head* rose on the institution of the French empire under Napoleon in 1804. But that were not only to contradict the symbol which has no eighth head, but to overturn his construction.

2. But Napoleon, emperor of France, did not present a single characteristic that can justly be held to identify him as the power denoted by the seventh head of the beast. He was not the monarch of the whole western empire, nor was he of a line that had been its monarchs. He was simply the emperor of France and the territories that were annexed to it from Italy, Switzerland, and parts of Germany and Dalmatia, and was a power therefore of which a horn is the symbol, not a head. Nor were the monarchs of all the other kingdoms of whichthe horns are the symbols, brought into a condition of subordination to him. The kings of England and Austria maintained a perfect independence of him through his whole career; and through a large part of it the kings also of Portugal, Spain, Prussia, and Bavaria. How could he be considered as the head of the whole western empire, when all its principal monarchies, instead of acting the part of subordinate horns, and giving their power to him, were, through most of his reign, not only independent of him, but actually arrayed against him, and engaged in a deadly war to divest him of his power?

3. Mr. Faber regards the fall of Napoleon in 1815 as the event denoted by the deadly wound inflicted on one of the heads of the beast; but it presents no analogy to it. Napoleon was not put to death by the sword. He abdicated his throne voluntarily, surrendered himself to the British, and was transported to St. Helena, where, after several years, he died a natural death. What adaptation has a death stroke by a sword on a head of the beast, to represent such an event? It might as well be pretended, that the voluntary resignation of the imperial crown by Charles V. was the

event foreshown by that wound of the beast. The acts, though prompted by different motives, were of essentially the same nature.

In the third place: Nor does the present emperor of France present one of the characteristics that is essential to identify him as the power denoted by the seventh head of the beast, on its restoration from its deadly wound, or the beast in its last form. It was not by a public act of the national legislature, the people, or of Louis Napoleon himself, rescinding the voluntary abdication of Napoleon in 1815, nor any other act bearing an analogy to healing a wound, that he reconstituted the French empire, and assumed its sceptre. He seized the supreme power by force, and wrought the change in the constitution of the kingdom by his mere despotic will. It was as new and arbitrary a creation, as the first institution of the empire was by Napoleon in 1804.

Nor does the French monarchy present any analogy to the wild beast in its last form. Mr. Faber supposes that the present French emperorship answers to the power denoted by the beast in its last form immediately before it is to go to destruction. But at that stage of its career, as symbolized Rev. xvii., it is to exist, not under one of its seven heads, but under an eighth king, who is to be, in some relation, the chief of the whole empire—contemporaneously with whom there are to be ten kings that are to give him their power, and conspire to do his will. But Louis Napoleon, at present at least, has neither of these characteristics. He is not, in any sense, the head of the whole western empire, as the several powers were that were symbolized by the seven heads; nor are the whole of the other monarchs, or any ten of them, in any subordination to him, or leagued with him in any form for the accomplishment of his will. He is the mere chief of France, and has no more control over any of the other monarchs than they have over him. There is not the slightest ground, therefore, for the pretence that he answers to the beast in its last form immediately before it is to go to perdition.

We might adduce many other objections to his view of the beast, and the arguments by which he endeavors to sustain it, but these sufficiently show that he is wholly in error in imagining that the imperial lines of France and Germany,

from the 9th to the 19th century, are the powers symbolized by the sixth head, and that of modern France the rule denoted by the seventh head; and that the present French emperorship, and the other monarchies of western Europe, answer to the beast on its emergence from the abyss in its last form.

What, then, are the peculiarities that are to distinguish the supreme rule of the western empire at the epoch represented by this vision? Is there reason to believe that the beast from the abyss (Rev. xvii.) denotes a form of the government of the empire, that differs in important respects from that which is symbolized by the beast from the sea, Rev. xiii.? If so, what are those differences? And has the change from the one to the other already taken place; or is it still future? These are questions of much greater moment than those we have thus far discussed, and deserve the most careful attention. We shall state what seem to us sufficient reasons for the belief, that the powers denoted by the two beasts differ from each other far more widely than has been generally supposed, and that the transition, from the first to the last, has yet to take place.

It is clear, indeed, from the prophecy, and is generally held by expositors, that the powers represented by the two beasts are essentially the same; that is, that the rulers whom each denotes are the supreme political rulers of the western Roman empire, and during the period of the powers symbolized by the horns. That they are such, is apparent from the fact that each has the seven heads, and each the ten horns; that the diadems of the first beast were borne by the horns, indicating that the rulers whom they symbolize were in possession of the supreme power; and that the horns of the beast in its last form, though not said to be invested with diadems, are yet expressly declared to have the authority of kings, and to exercise that authority in doing the will of the beast. Their general identity is also made clear by the declaration, that the beast from the abyss is the beast that was and is not. They are unquestionably, therefore, so far the same, that they represent the supreme political rulers of the ten kingdoms of the western Roman empire.

Each beast is said also to have on it a name or names of blasphemy; each was the object of wonder to the inhabitants

of the earth; each was to sustain an intimate relation to the apostate church denoted by the beast with two horns, and the woman of Babylon; and each was to persecute the saints.

While, therefore, the beast from the abyss differs from the beast from the sea, as in its scarlet color, and its being full of names of blasphemy, instead of bearing them simply on its heads, their general resemblance is such, that many writers have supposed that they were either absolutely the same, or at least that the emergence of the one from the sea, and of the other from the abyss,—which is the name sometimes applied by Greek authors to the deepest parts of the sea,—was not to be considered as indicating that they differed essentially from each other, or that they had a different origin: and that was the view we at one time entertained. The term abyss, however, may justly be regarded as denoting that the emergence of the beast of the 17th chapter is a different one from that of chapter xiii. from the sea; for although the word is sometimes used by profane authors as the name of the deep recesses of the sea, it is never used in that sense in the New Testament, but only of hades or the prison of spirits considered as a fathomless pit in the earth. Thus Rom. x. 7, it denotes the world of the dead; Luke viii. 31, the prison of demons; Rev. xx. 1–3, the prison—probably the same—in which Satan was confined; and Rev. ix. 1, 2, 11, the same also, it would seem, as it was shut with a door and fastened with a key, and was the recess from which the smoke and locusts of the fifth trumpet arose. As it is thus in all the instances of its occurrence in the New Testament—besides the passages that relate to the wild beast—the name of the under world, or realms of the dead, it must undoubtedly be considered as used in that sense also in these passages. The emergence, then, of the wild beast from the abyss (Rev. xi. 7 and xvii. 8) is a different event from the emergence of the beast from the sea, Rev. xiii. 1. As the form in which it existed after its emergence from the abyss, was the form in which it went to perdition, and therefore its last form, its ascent from the abyss took place after its ascent from the sea. Its coming up from the world of the dead, implies accordingly that it had perished in its first form anterior to its rise from the realms of the dead in its last. The symbol seems plainly, therefore, to indicate that

the monarchies of the ten kingdoms, represented by the ten horns of the beast in its first form, are to be overthrown and disappear before the rise of the beast in its last form. A general revolution, it implies, is to take place either by the spontaneous act of the people, by the interposition of a conqueror, or perhaps by both, in which the dynasties of the kingdoms, denoted by the horns of the beast that came up from the sea, are to be struck from life, or from power; and the beast in its last form, with a like number of horns, is then to arise, run its brief career, and go to perdition.

But there are other indications also that it is to differ widely from the beast from the sea. During the reign of the beast from the sea, the diadems on the horns show that the kings which they denote exercised the supreme rule of the empire. The heads, so far as the western empire was concerned, had all previously fallen. But after the emergence of the beast from the abyss, the kings symbolized by the horns are to exercise but a subordinate authority. The supreme power is to be held by an eighth king or line, like those of the seven heads, and the kings are to act simply as allied, confederate, or dependent chiefs, who are to co-operate with that eighth king, and employ themselves in doing his will. Thus the language of the angel is: "The seven heads are seven mountains, where the woman sat on them, and are seven kings. Five have fallen, one is, the other has not yet come, and when it has come it must continue a little while. And the beast—which was and is not—is also ογδοος [βασιλευς], an eighth [king], and is of the seven, and goes to destruction. And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings which have not yet received a kingdom, but receive authority as kings the same hour with the beast." Here, after the seven heads and the seven mountains, where the woman sat, are interpreted as the symbols of seven kings, five of whom had fallen, one was then reigning, and the other was yet to come; το θηριον, the beast, which was and is not, and was to ascend from the abyss, is declared to be αυτος ογδοος, himself an eighth βασιλευς, king, and of the seven; that is, of the same order or class as the seven, in distinction from the inferior rank symbolized by the horns; for that is undoubtedly the relation in which he is of the seven. He cannot be a lineal descendant of the seven; for they were not of one

family or genealogical line; nor did any one of those denoted by the heads regularly or often transmit his office to his offspring by inheritance. The supreme offices in the Roman empire from its foundation to the fall of Augustulus were generally elective, not hereditary. Besides, the rulers symbolized by the heads passed out of life ages before the rise of the eighth king, so that no genealogical connexion can possibly be traced betwixt them. Nor can he be of the seven as a mere successor. If he were a successor, it would be only of the kings symbolized by the seventh head, not of the whole seven. A king who is the first of a new dynasty is the successor simply of the dynasty or rule that immediately preceded him; not of other orders of rulers that have had no existence for ages. But he cannot be the successor even of the line of kings denoted by the seventh head, inasmuch as that line has had no existence in the western empire for near fourteen hundred years, and his predecessors through that long period in the sovereignty of the empire are the monarchs of the ten kingdoms symbolized by the horns, who are of a wholly different order. The only sense, then, in which he can be of the seven, is that of rank or characteristics, as the sovereign of the whole empire, in contradistinction from the ten kings who are mere monarchs of the subordinate kingdoms into which the empire is divided, and have severally no jurisdiction over it at large. The eighth king is, then, to be the absolute chief of the whole empire, and in such a relation that he and the subordinate officers of *his* general government will constitute the imperial power represented by the beast; while the kings denoted by the horns and the organizations of which they are to be the chiefs, will be subordinate to the imperial government; in a manner, perhaps, not unlike that in which in this country the state officials are subordinate to the President of the United States and the national government; or that in which the kings conquered by the Romans often retained their titles and thrones, and exercised a jurisdiction over their kingdoms in subordination to the imperial rule. Such an emperor exercising sovereign rule over the whole empire, might justly, notwithstanding the authority of the ten kings, be represented by the beast; and there is no other relation in which the beast could be properly used as his

western emperor. It explains also the surprise of the people of the empire at its reappearance. "Those who dwell on the earth, whose names are not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world, shall wonder, seeing the beast that was, and is not, and yet is." If the powers symbolized by the beast from the sea are to disappear ere those represented by the beast from the abyss rise into existence, the emergence of the new organization, so closely resembling in structure and spirit that which had perished, may justly strike them with surprise and astonishment.

The event denoted by the rise of the beast from the abyss is obviously, then, still future. There has been no period since the establishment of the ten kingdoms at the fall of Augustulus, when the whole of the ten monarchies, which then assumed the sovereignty, fell, disappeared like the spirits of the dead, and left the empire in a condition of political dissolution. No monarch has risen since that period, answering to the eighth king as here described, who possessed supreme sovereignty over the whole empire, contemporaneously with ten chiefs of its subordinate divisions, holding authority under him *as* kings, and uniting in giving to him their power, and in doing his will. Nothing approaching such an organization of the empire existed under Charlemagne or his line, under the German emperors, or even under Napoleon Bonaparte. He not only was never, in any sense, the monarch of Great Britain, Ireland, Portugal, and Spain; but he was not even of any considerable portion of Germany, beyond the Rhine; though he conquered a large share of it, and its princes were his confederates and vassals.

That its rise is still future, is seen also from the persecution and slaughter of the witnesses, which it is to cause. It is the wild beast that ascends out of the abyss, that "is to make war with them and overcome them, and slay them;" and that is to take place when they would finish their testimony of twelve hundred and sixty years. But no such slaughter and resurrection as is predicted of them has yet taken place, nor have the twelve hundred and sixty years of their testimony, and of the reign of the beast from the sea, yet reached their end.

If this interpretation then is correct, a vast and momentous

change is yet to take place in the political organization of Europe ere the powers symbolized by the wild beasts are to reach their final catastrophe. The present monarchies are to pass out of existence, or undergo an essential modification in some terrible convulsion or conflict that is to agitate the nations; and from the abyss into which they sink, a chief is to rise, who shall acquire a sovereignty over the whole empire, and exercise an imperial rule, while the territory shall be divided into ten subordinate states, with each a separate organization, and a chief having the rank of a king, that shall reign in conjunction with, and in subordination to him.

That such a change is possible, no one can doubt. The dissatisfaction with their present rulers that pervades Germany, Spain, Portugal, and Italy especially, renders it probable, that the next war that arises will become a war of insurrection and revolution, and lead to the overthrow of some, at least, of the present governments. Should it be a war between France, for example, under her present chief, and Belgium, Prussia, Austria, Naples, Spain, or Portugal, or all of them, his policy would naturally be, to detach the people from their present rulers, and draw them to his side by promises of the right of suffrage, and an elective government; and such a pledge to the people of Germany, Italy, or the Peninsula, backed by a powerful army, would, in their present disposition, instantly excite them to insurrection, draw immense crowds to his standard, and if he gained the first great battle, lead immediately to the fall of the present dynasties. Nor can such a result of an invasion of Great Britain be considered as impossible; one great victory might enable him to detach Ireland from the empire, and erect it into a separate state, if requisite to make up the number ten, and force the monarchy, as the condition of its continued existence at least, to a subordination to him, and a concurrence in his policy as the upholder of the papacy and persecutor of Protestants. However unlikely it may seem, and with whatever dread we may contemplate it, it cannot be justly thought more improbable, than several of the events that have taken place within the last few years, nor even than some of the political and ecclesiastical occurrences that have happened in Great Britain and Ireland within the present century.

When, then, is this momentous change to take place? At the close, it is probable, of the twelve hundred and sixty years: as we are told that power was given to the beast from the sea, "to act, forty and two months," during which, he opened his mouth in blasphemy. It is the period, therefore, during which he usurps the place and prerogatives of God, by assuming dominion over the Christian religion and the church, and subjecting them to his laws; and is to be reckoned from the complete nationalization of the Catholic hierarchies, which was near the close, there is reason to believe, of the sixth century. Of the last two, that of Italy was nationalized in A.D. 591; and that of Kent, in 597, 598, 599, or at the latest, within a few years of that time. If the forty-two months, then, are the measure of that beast's career, it will reach its catastrophe, there is reason to believe, within five, six, seven, or at the furthest, a few more years; and the population of the ten kingdoms, it will undoubtedly be admitted, were never before in a condition that rendered a revolution of the kind so practicable and so probable.

If the period of the beast from the sea is that of the twelve hundred and sixty years, the career of the beast from the abyss is probably to occupy the thirty years that are to follow, and make the twelve hundred and ninety.

The great measures that are to be pursued by the beast in its new and last form, the prophecy represents, are first, the support of the apostate church, symbolized by the Babylonian woman, in her supremacy, her endeavor to entice the nations to partake of her abominations, and her persecution and slaughter of the saints. The prophet says, "I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet colored beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet color, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and the impurities of her fornication; and upon her forehead, a name written, Mystery; Babylon the great, the mother of the harlots, and the abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunk with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus; and I wondered seeing her, with great wonder." The station of the woman on the beast, indicates, that the ecclesiastical powers which she represents, are to be

nationalized, and enjoy the support and favor of the sovereign and the subordinate rulers of the empire; and as it is the same woman who sat at the seven mountains, the seat of the Romish church, and the many waters, which symbolize the various peoples of the empire; and as with her, the kings of *all* the kingdoms committed fornication; it is not improbable, that she is the representative alone of the Catholic hierarchies. If so, it indicates that the Catholic church is to be nationalized at that period, throughout the empire; and may imply, therefore, that the present Protestant churches will have fallen from that relation; or if not, that they are no longer to be the sole state churches of the kingdoms in which they shall still subsist. The former cannot be deemed improbable in any of the Protestant countries of the continent; nor the latter at least, in Great Britain and Ireland. And if the Catholics of England, Scotland, and Ireland, should be nationalized, it is not unlikely that the evangelical would generally withdraw from the Protestant establishments, and that the remainder would conform to the Romish church, if any powerful motive prompted to it, such as the retention of place, eligibility to office, or the continued possession of the colleges, church edifices, and property that once belonged to the Catholics, and leave no Protestant establishment in existence.

Next. The imperial government thus supporting the apostate church, is to second her in her endeavors to force the whole people into her communion, and is for that purpose to persecute those who reject her sway, and to put the witnesses to death. Her endeavor to allure the people into her communion is indicated by her bearing in her hand the cup of her abominations; and her instigation of a war on those who resist her rule, by her drunkenness with the blood of the slain. The prophet saw her drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus, implying that she was prompted by an eager and remorseless appetite for their blood, and that she caused them to be slaughtered on a vast scale. As the state in which she is exhibited in this vision is that which is immediately to precede her judgment and destruction, the persecution in which she is thus to become drunk with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus, is to take place near the close of her career,

and is undoubtedly, therefore, still future. It is expressly foreshown also, Rev. xi. 7, that the slaughter of the witnesses is to be the work of the beast that ascends from the abyss, and is to take place at the end of the twelve hundred and sixty years, and before the end of the second woe, and the sounding of the seventh trumpet. "And when the witnesses," we are told, "would finish their testimony"—which, as it is to continue a thousand two hundred and three score days, is to terminate with the twelve hundred and sixty years—"the wild beast that ascends out of the abyss shall make war on them, and shall overcome them, and shall kill them." As this is to be the work of the beast from the abyss, and is to take place a short time before the termination of the second woe, or end of the Turkish domination over the eastern churches, and the blast of the seventh trumpet, it is indisputably still future, while it is scarcely less certain that it is near at hand.

Third. Though the imperial government symbolized by the beast, and the kings of the ten kingdoms, are at this period to coöperate with the Catholic hierarchy, and execute its bloody will, yet, at a later stage of their career, the kings are to turn against her. "The ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, they shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For God hath put into their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the beast,"—the supreme imperial rule,—"until the words of God shall be fulfilled." This change may take place partly, perhaps, in consequence of a change in the disposition of the people toward the papacy, occasioned by the resurrection of the witnesses and demonstration thereby that she is a false instead of a true church; but still more not improbably by some new policy of the imperial and state rulers, in which the Catholic hierarchy will refuse to concur. Finding her, instead of a coöperator, a formidable obstacle to their schemes, they may attempt to scourge her into subserviency, or at least deprive her of her power to obstruct them, and raise in the process a popular movement against her, which will go beyond their intentions, and render it impossible for them to preserve her from destruction, though they may desire it. And this seems to be indicated in the description

of her overthrow, Rev. xviii., in which the kings of the earth are represented as standing at a distance, and bewailing her burning, as though it were the work of the population which they would prevent, were it in their power.

Fourth. At a still later period, the beast and kings are to make war with the Lamb, and are to perish. "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them; for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful." This war with the Lamb is to be a different war from that which the beast is to wage against the saints; as in the latter it is to conquer the saints and witnesses, and put them to death; but in the war with the Lamb, it is itself to be conquered. This war is therefore to be that, doubtless, of the great day of God Almighty, symbolized Rev. xix. 11–21, when the Word of God is to descend with his risen saints; the wild beast and false prophet are to be taken and cast alive into perdition; and their armies are to be slain and given to the fowls of heaven.

This great revelation indicates how it may happen that the supreme civil power may be induced to persecute the true worshippers and witnesses, throughout the whole empire. When such a power as he, whom the prophecy foreshows, rises to an absolute sovereignty over the whole empire, and in a close alliance with the papal hierarchy, a powerful motive may arise to endeavor to force the whole population into her communion, for the sake of securing her support to himself, and strengthening his rule. And as when he nationalizes the Catholic church throughout his dominions, and endeavors to force his subjects to unite in her worship, the worshippers of God and witnesses of Jesus will infallibly resist, and will denounce that church as an apostate, and him as a usurper, and forewarn them and their subjects of the doom that awaits them, he may naturally be prompted by pride, resentment, and desperation, to endeavor to arrest and exterminate them, and may be induced, by the expectations they will avow of a resurrection, to pursue the course that is foreshown in the prophecy, in putting them to death at one time, preserving them unburied, and allowing the people to have access to them, that they may have ample assurance of their death; that they may be able to know when the day

of their expected resurrection arrives, that they are the identical persons who were slain as Christ's witnesses; and that they may then be present and have a convincing demonstration if the witnesses should not rise, of the falsehood of their hopes, and the delusion of their whole party. That course will be altogether natural to such a power in the condition in which it will then be placed.

We may see how it may happen that the witnesses themselves and believers generally will then know with abundant certainty that those who are to be slain and treated as the prediction of the slaughter foreshows, are the true witnesses of Jesus, and are, at the predicted time, to be raised from death. The rise of such an imperial power in the empire as is depicted in this prophecy, the subordination to him of ten sub-kingdoms, and the nationalization of the Catholic hierarchy throughout the empire, will indicate with the utmost clearness to all who have eyes to see, that he is the monarch who is foreshown in this prophecy, and show the point that is reached in its fulfilment. All who fear God and sincerely seek to understand his word, startled from their inattention and unbelief, will abandon the false notions they have entertained of the great scheme of God's providence, and will see with the clearest certainty that the crisis that impends, is that which he has foreshown as the slaughter of his witnesses, whom he is to vindicate from the aspersions of the false church and the usurping civil rulers, and own and glorify as his true servants by a public resurrection. The witnesses will undoubtedly die therefore with a full faith in their resurrection; and their friends who survive will await the appointed time of their restoration in a full faith that it will be accomplished.

We may see how it may happen that while these great events are approaching and in progress, or exerting the influences with which they will naturally be charged after their occurrence, such a discrimination and public manifestation of the servants of God may take place, as that which is indicated by their being sealed with his name on their foreheads. The dissentients from the apostate church will be put to a public and terrible trial of their allegiance to him, and compelled either to apostatize, or show their fidelity by open and decisive acts; and the test will be their submission to or resistance of the usurped authority of the civil rulers, and apostate

church. The question will be, who is of supreme authority in religion? Who is to be acknowledged as the rightful lawgiver of the church? Who is to determine the conditions and dispense the blessings of redemption? Jehovah, the Creator and Redeemer; or his antagonists, the powers whom he has represented by the wild beast and false prophet? And the conspicuous and influential of his people will be led to a manifestation of their unhesitating and joyous allegiance to him, and rejection of the impious claims of his foes.

We may see also how the people of God will naturally be prepared by these great events to proclaim the gospel on a scale far greater than at any former period, to the nations of the earth, and especially to warn them that the hour of his judgment has come. They will no longer be left in doubt whether the last vials of his wrath are pouring, and the time of Christ's advent is at hand, when he is to take vengeance on those who are arrayed against him and give salvation to his people. They will understand the true nature of the events as they succeed one another, and contemplate them with the watchfulness, awe, and expectation, they will be adapted to inspire.

If this construction of the prophecy is correct, it is apparent that the questions that are in debate between those who look for the advent of Christ, anterior to the millennium, and those who reject that doctrine, will very soon be settled. The rise of antichrist to such a height of power, and fierce and remorseless war, on the true worshippers, will show all who are disposed to discern the truth, the error of the expectation that is so generally cherished, that the world is to be converted by the instruments that are now employed for the purpose. The slaughter of the witnesses of Jesus, the interposition of the Almighty to raise them from death, and the literal overthrow and destruction of the apostate church, will convince them, beyond the possibility of doubt, what the principles are on which the prophecies are to be interpreted, and demonstrate the error of treating them as mere myths, or shadowy figures charged with only a vague allegorical sense, which fancy is to shape and color as it pleases, and

ed them to look for a like literal accomplishment of all

events,—the resurrection of the holy dead, the ad-

rist, the destruction of the antichristian powers,

the binding of Satan, the establishment of Christ's throne on the earth, the conversion of the nations—that are represented by the prophecy as speedily to follow the seventh trumpet. The spiritually blind, the violently prejudiced, the worldly ambitious, the hostile, will doubtless continue to disbelieve, to misrepresent, and to mock, till the end; but unbelief and obstinate opposition will become impossible to those who have the Spirit of God. *They* will lay aside their prepossessions. They will dispassionately study his word. They will submissively receive its teachings, and will welcome with joy and adoration the great certainty which they will then see is inscribed in characters of light on its pages, that he is to come in person to achieve the redemption of his people, and is to reign here for ever in glory over the ransomed race.

Art. VIII.—A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapter XXIV.

The prophecy of this, and the three following chapters, has received from expositors a great variety of constructions. Of a large class who regard it as relating exclusively to Palestine, some hold, that it had its fulfilment in the devastation of that country by the Assyrians; some, by the Babylonians; others, by the Syrian Greeks; and still others, by the Romans. Another class, refer it to an age that is still future, and look for its accomplishment at the time when the antichristian powers are to be overthrown, as foretold by Daniel and John, the nations judged, and the Israelites recalled from their dispersion, converted, and reestablished in their ancient land. That view was entertained by Jerome, Theodoret, and several Jewish expositors; is held also by some who have written recently; and is, we think, the true construction. 1. There is nothing in the prophecy which indicates that the calamities it foreshows were those which were inflicted by the Assyrians, Babylonians, Syrian Greeks, or Romans. There is nothing said of the march of armies, of battles, and slaughters, of the siege and capture of cities, and the destruction of the temple, or of the removal of the surviving population into other lands. 2. It does

But that is to confound the imagined figure. If the earth were exhibited as a vessel, it would not be said to be poured out. To speak of pouring out the *contents* of a vessel, is legitimate; but to speak of pouring out a vessel itself, is solecistical. A goblet may be emptied of the element which it contains; it cannot itself be poured out; as that would require that it should become fluid, or so disintegrated as to be capable of motion like a fluid.

The term empty, is used then by a metaphor, to denote that the earth is to be devastated, or swept of its culture, and made waste; and its face is used by the same figure, for its surface. What the agents are, by which these changes are to be wrought, the language does not clearly show. That great changes, of the nature here indicated, are to be wrought at Christ's coming, is foreshown in other passages, especially Zech. xiv. 3–11; 2 Pet. iii. 10. The effect of them is to be the dissolution of governments, or the disorganization of the people, denoted by their being dispersed. This is seen from the next verse, in which their several ranks are exhibited, as divested of all that had before distinguished them, and reduced to the same level.

3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Comparisons. "And it shall be, as the people, so the priest; as the servant, so his master; as the maid, so her mistress; as the buyer, so the seller; as the borrower, so the lender; as the debtor, so the creditor," v. 2. Those of every class, who have a position above others, whether it be of office, rank, or property, are to lose all their peculiar prerogatives, and be reduced to an equality in those respects with their inferiors and dependents. This indicates an annihilation of the rights of property, and a dissolution of society. The old relations are to be abolished; and all things in the social and political sphere be made new. Such a condition of the different ranks is described under the sixth seal, when under the terrors of the Redeemer's advent to inflict his wrath on his enemies, "the kings of the earth and the great men, and the rich, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid themselves in the dens, and in the rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand."—Rev. vi. 15–17.

The prophet now turns to a class of persons surviving this catastrophe who differ from those he had hitherto mentioned, and are joyfully to recognize and acknowledge God in it, and celebrate his majesty.

20, 21. Comparisons of the survivors to the olives and grapes that remain after the crop has been gathered. "So shall it be in the midst of the earth among the nations, as the shaking of an olive tree, like gleanings when the vintage is done. They shall lift up their voice; they shall sing for the majesty of the Lord; they shall cry aloud from the sea," v. 13, 14. That but few are to remain in the midst—that is, in the central portions of the earth, and among the nations—shows that the inflictions by which they are to be so diminished are not to be confined to Palestine, but are to extend through the populous parts of the world. That which follows is probably a part of the song. "Therefore in the fires glorify Jehovah; the name of Jehovah God of Israel in the isles of the sea," v. 15. In the next verse those who had summoned the nations to glorify Jehovah, report that they had heard a song from the remotest regions congratulating the righteous: doubtless on their salvation: while the prophet bursts into expressions of grief at seeing that there still were deceivers who were deluding others and leading them to destruction.

22. Elliptical metaphor in the use of wing, to denote border, or extremity. "From the wing of the earth have we heard songs:—honor to the righteous. But I said, woe to me, woe to me, alas for me; the deceivers deceive; with deceit the deceivers deceive," v. 16. This shows that there are still to be several classes on the earth. There are to be the righteous who are to celebrate the majesty of Jehovah with joy. There are perhaps to be others too, who, awed and overwhelmed by the presence of the Judge, are to see that none but the righteous can meet his acceptance, and are to acknowledge it, and congratulate them on their safety. But there are to be others also, and of two classes; first, some who, probably having previously acted the part of false teachers, are to con-
e their treacherous work, and endeavor still to retain
who have been their victims, under their power, and
m on in alienation and delusion; and next, those
ey deceive. A similar prediction is made by other

prophets. Daniel foreshows that to the last "the wicked shall do wickedly, and none of them shall understand;" and John that the apostate ministers who are represented by great Babylon, instead of reforming, are after their fall to gather to their train the most debased and desperate that can be found. The prophet next depicts the terrors and dangers to which they are to be exposed who yield to the arts of the deceiving, and are to meet unsheltered the storm of divine vengeance.

23. Metonymy, of fear for that which causes it. "Fear, and the pit, and the snare upon thee, O inhabitants of the earth; and it shall come to pass that he who flees from the noise of the fear shall fall into the pit; and he who comes up from the midst of the pit shall be taken in the snare; for windows from on high are open, and the foundations of the earth are shaken," v. 18.

24, 25. Elliptical metaphors, in denominating seeming openings in the clouds through which lightnings and torrents of rain descend, windows; and the interior parts of the earth on which the surface rests, its foundations. This description indicates that a tempest is to descend on them, while an earthquake is to shake the ground on which they stand. The snare is probably the toil spread for them by the deceivers, which makes destruction sure to those who become entangled in it.

The effect of these destructive agents on the earth itself is next described. "The earth is wholly broken; the earth is utterly shattered; the earth is wholly shaken," v. 19. This is such a delineation as one might naturally give who witnessed the repeated heave, and wrench, and whirl of an earthquake, over a wide region; and saw the ground still trembling from the continuous shocks.

26, 27. Comparisons of the motion of the earth to that of a drunken man, and a lodge or bed suspended in the air. "The earth reels, reels like a drunken man, and is shaken like a watch-lodge," v. 20. This is descriptive of the effects of an earthquake, by which the forests and trees are swayed to and fro, and portions of the hills are made to slide into the valleys.

28, 29. Metaphors, in the ascription of weight to the sins by which the earth is polluted, as though they were a material substance, and representing it as falling. "And her trans-

gression is heavy upon her, and she shall fall, and not rise again," v. 20. This also is frequently the effect of an earthquake; not only are rocks and hills shaken down, but the surface over wide regions sometimes sinks so as to be overrun by the sea, and pass out of sight, as though it had descended into the depths of the earth itself.

30. Hypocatastasis, in the substitution of visit, for the infliction of punishment. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that Jehovah shall visit upon the host of the high place, in the high place, and upon the kings of the earth upon the earth," v. 21. To visit, is to arraign and punish. This great crisis is to be the time of the punishment of the kings of the earth, and the hosts that are associated with them in their official relations and stations; and this accords with the representation in Daniel and John, that at the epoch of the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds, the powers symbolized by the ten horned wild beast, and the kings and their armies, who are then to be assembled for battle against him, are to be taken in the conflict and destroyed.

31. Comparison of the mode in which they are to be gathered, to that in which prisoners are collected and shut up. "And they shall be gathered with a gathering as prisoners in a pit; and shall be shut in a dungeon," v. 22.

32. Hypocatastasis, in the use of visiting, for judging and punishing. "And after many days they shall be visited," v. 22. As hades is doubtless to be their dungeon, the many days that are to intervene between their being gathered there and their final judgment, are, we must suppose, the period denoted by the thousand years of the saints' reign on the earth with Christ; and this is confirmed by the next verse, in which Jehovah is exhibited as then reigning on Mount Zion.

33, 34. Metaphors, in exhibiting the moon as confounded, and the sun ashamed, because of the glorious presence of Jehovah in Zion. "Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, for Jehovah of hosts reigns on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his elders in glory," v. 23. This also is in harmony with Christ's promise to his disciples, that "at the regeneration," or new creation of the earth,

> hen the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory,"
> "shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve
> f Israel."—Matt. xix. 28.

There are, thus, throughout the chapter, the most decided marks that its great predictions are to have their accomplishment in the judgment and destruction of Christ's enemies, the deliverance and redemption of his people, and the establishment of his throne on the earth at his second coming. This construction is not merely probable—it is not merely confirmed by every stroke of the graphic delineations of the chapter—but it is the only construction that can be put upon it, without doing violence to its terms, and defacing the peculiar features of its most important predictions, by which they resemble the other great descriptions of the acts and events that are to attend and follow Christ's advent, judgment of his armed enemies, deliverance of his friends, and redemption of the world.

Art. IX.—The Symbols of the Sixth Vial.

The Euphrates of the sixth vial has, for more than two centuries, been very generally regarded as representing the Turkish empire; and it was at a still earlier day considered as denoting a political or military power, and usually one that was arrayed against the church. Thus Haymo, who flourished in the ninth century, explained it of a political body: "By the river Euphrates, in which the angels were bound, a worldly or political power is to be understood. For the Euphrates is the river of Babylon. The Medes and Persians turned it aside, and through its channel entered the city. The river is often used in a bad sense;"—that is, as the representative of a power hostile to God's people. Per flumen Euphratem, in quo angeli alligati sunt, potentia sæcularis intelligitur. Euphrates quippe fluvius Babyloniæ est. Medi et Persæ hunc diviserunt fluvium, et per ejus alveum ingressi sunt Babyloniam. Quod flumen sæpe in malum partem ponitur.

Nicholas de Lyra, who wrote in the early part of the fourteenth century, represents that it was interpreted by some of that age, of the German empire, and was thought to have had its fulfilment in the evils inflicted by Gregory VII. on Henry IV. and his princes, in withdrawing from them the

right of investiture, sentencing them to excommunication, and divesting them of their political power. He regarded it, however, as more probably representing the Saracens in Spain in the eighth century, and as having had its accomplishment in the slaughter and defeat of their army by Charlemagne, by which their conquests in that part of Europe were arrested, and their power broken.

But though it has generally for a thousand years received a construction of that kind, there yet have been writers, for the last five or six centuries, who have interpreted the river as denoting something having a relation to the mystic Babylon of the prophecy, like that of the literal Euphrates to the ancient capital of that name; have regarded the city as symbolizing, in some form, the apostate church; and have interpreted the river, as we have done, as denoting the people who are the subjects and supporters of its hierarchies. Thus Peter Olivi, a Franciscan of the thirteenth century, wrote: Potestas Papæ et *multitudo plebium sibi obediens*, et favor ipsius, est quasi magnus fluvius Euphrates impediens transitum et insultum æmulorum Evangelici status in ipsum.—*Wordsworth's Lectures on the Apocalypse*, p. 320. "The power of the Pope, *and the multitude of the people obeying him*, is as it were a great river Euphrates, obstructing the passage and attack of competitors or aspirants to the religious sway he possesses." He thus exhibits the river as symbolizing the people who are subject to her rule. "The Babylon of Revelation is uniformly represented by him as the corrupt church of Rome, hurrying to the judgment; and he describes her corruption in the plainest terms. 'She is Babylon the great harlot, because wickedness thrives and spreads in her, not only intensively but extensively; so that the good in her is like a few grains of gold in a vast sand heap: and as the Jews in Babylon were captives and grievously oppressed, so will the spirit of the righteous, in this period, be oppressed and afflicted beyond endurance by the countless host of a fleshly church, which they are enforced to serve against their will.'" ..... "The seat of corruption is more especially in the carnal *clergy*, who hold the high places of Babylon: there it exists to a far greater extent than in the communities under them."—*Neander's Ch. His.*, vol. iv., p. 624.

Much the same view was entertained by Flacius, who says in his comment:

"Hæc plaga Dei de exsiccato Euphrate, ut reges orientis venire, expugnare ac intrare hanc spiritualem Babylonem possint, sumpta est ex Jeremiæ li. cap: ubi hoc idem praedicitur hisce verbis: Arefaciam mare ejus; exsiccabo fontem ejus; stagna ejus exusta sunt. Quod postea opere ac eventu ipso perfectum esse testantur profani hostorici, avertente Cyro et Dario Euphratem, ne aliquandiu per alveum flueret in Babylonem, et illac exercitu subito noctu intrante. Ad captivitatem autem spiritualis istius Babylonis ita id referri posset, quod sicut Euphrates et muniebat et ornabat et ditabat illam Babylonem, qui aversus et exsiccatus prebuit hostibus introitum; ita etiam innumera priviligia juraque ac dignitates opesque terrenæ, variis aucupiis et fraudibus conquisitae aliique reditus Ecclesiatici aversi ne ad istam Babylonem confluant, dent occasionem ut ejus turba monachorum et spiritualium valde imminuatur. *Significant etiam aquæ populos ut postea dicetur.* Illi igitur abducti, ne Antichristo adhæreant, paulatim eum debiliorem relinquunt. Sicut etiam reges et potentes oppugnantes illam Babylonem fuerunt orentaliores ea, utpote Persæ ac Medi, ita etiam pii venientes a Christo sole justitiæ, seu doctores ab hoc sole exoriente illuminati, expugnant hanc spiritualem Babylonem. Observatu etiam dignum est, ad intellectum Jeremiæ, quod hic Apocalypsis ei veluti glossam addit, ideo Euphratem esse exsiccatum, ut præpararetur via regibus orientalibus, nempe perquam intrarent in Babylonem, uti dictum est, illos per exsiccatum Euphratis alveum noctu in urbem intrasse." "This plague of the drying of the Euphrates, that kings of the east might come, attack, and enter the spiritual Babylon, is taken from Jer. chap. li., where the same event is predicted, thus, 'I will dry up her sea, and make her springs dry;' which was accomplished by Cyrus and Darius, who, turning the river from its bed, the army suddenly entered the city by its channel: and this is to be referred, in like manner, to the capture of the spiritual Babylon: so that as the Euphrates, which at once protected, adorned, and enriched Babylon, on being turned aside and dried up, gave an entrance to it to

the enemy; so also the numerous privileges, rights, dignities, and the riches acquired by art and fraud, being intercepted from longer flowing into this Babylon, will cause a diminution of its monks and other religious orders. *Waters likewise signify peoples. Their being detached from antichrist will, therefore, gradually weaken him.*"

He thus recognizes the alienation and withdrawment of the population from the hierarchies, as foreshown by the symbol. And that this is its true and sole meaning is seen from the consideration that the loss of her revenues will naturally result from the diminution of her subjects; not the diminution of her subjects from the lessening of the sums she extorts from them; and that the destruction of her merchandise, and the annihilation of her commerce, are to take place at the time of her own destruction, as foreshown Rev. xviii., which is to be under the seventh vial, while the drying of her river or alienation of her vassals occurs under the sixth.

Essentially the same view is given of the symbol by Biermann, a Dutch commentator, who published in 1702. He says, "Euphrates hic significat, non Turcas, qui ad Euphratem regnum constituere, in quatuor Sultanias partitum, ut Medus putat; vel Turcarum, Tartarorumve potentiam quæ valde crevit per Ottomannum anno Christi 1296, ut Napier aliique autumant: non enim hæc cum analogia phialarum, nec cum scopo Spiritus Sancti conveniunt; sed mysticæ Babylonis *potentiam*, regna, et populos validos et potentes, fulcientes thronum antichristi. Quomodo etiam alibi *flumina* pro regnis *aut* populis eorumque regibus usurpantur; Sic *Meretrix*, dicitur, *sedere* super *aquis multis*, quod exponit angelus de populis, turbis, gentibus, ac linguis.—Apoc. xvii. 15. . . . .

"Exsiccari dici potest hic Euphrates, quando reges populi et nationes regni antichristi, in quibus omne robur ejus situm est, vel sponte desierunt propugnare Babylonem, et sese subtraxerunt a bestiæ obedientia, vel justo Dei judicio ipsæ ad incitas redactæ, munimentum Babyloni, amplius non potuere esse."—Pp. 510, 511.

"This Euphrates does not denote the Turks who established a kingdom on that river, as was held by Mede; nor
e power of the Turks or Tartars, as it was increased under
man in 1296, as Napier and others supposed; but it re-
ts the *power* of the mystical Babylon; i. e. the king-

doms, and strong and influential people, that sustain the throne of antichrist. Thus, the harlot is said to sit at or amidst many waters, which the angel explains of peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues.

"This Euphrates may be said to be dried, when the kings, peoples, and nations of antichrist, in whom her strength lies, either voluntarily cease to defend Babylon and withdraw themselves from her service, or being themselves by the just judgment of God reduced to straits, can no longer be a bulwark to her."

Had he adhered rigidly to the explanation of the waters, given by the angel, he would have interpreted the river as denoting peoples and nations only, not kingdoms and kings. Waters are nowhere used in the prophecies as symbols of empires or their monarchs.

These constructions, which exhibit the symbol as foreshowing a general alienation and withdrawment of the people over whom the apostate hierarchies arrogated and exercised supreme power, is undoubtedly correct; and the prediction is receiving its fulfilment very conspicuously at the present time. The population of Italy especially, according to the representations that are made by all who have recently visited that country, or are in communication with persons of intelligence residing there, have not only lost their implicit faith in their clergy, attachment to them, and disposition to obey their behests; but have come to regard them with distrust and aversion as their worst social and political enemies, and are hoping for a speedy revolution in which they may free themselves from their domination. A high degree of alienation from the hierarchies prevails also throughout Germany, has long reigned in France, and in a measure in Spain and Portugal, is not unknown in Great Britain, and is at most points advancing at a rapid pace, and seems likely to become one of the most conspicuous, as it is one of the most peculiar features of the age. A few years further progress, and nothing will seem to be wanting but a public and formal expression of this hostile feeling, such as a moment of high excitement, and especially a hope of a general revolution might occasion, to render the fulfilment as clear and emphatic as the symbol itself is. The people are manifestly preparing, in their passions and purposes, to inflict on the hierarchies—when the revolution foreshown under the

seventh vial arrives—the vengeance by which she is then to be consigned to destruction.

On the other hand, the notion generally entertained by commentators, that the Euphrates is the symbol of the Turkish power, is as manifestly incorrect. The writers who hold that view, maintain that it ceased to be a woe to the Christian churches under its dominion, at least, a hundred and fifty years ago. But nothing can be more mistaken. The fact that the Turks ceased to extend their conquests to the west, towards the close of the seventeenth century, did not prevent their still retaining their power over their Christian subjects on the lower Danube, in Roumelia, Greece, Asia Minor, the isles of the Mediterranean, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt. Nor has it prevented their exercising over them during a large part of the time that has since passed, a cruel, bloody, and debasing domination. They have massacred crowds of them even during the present century. And that they are still under the sway of the Turkish government in their religious as well as their political relations, is seen from the negotiations that are now in progress between the Czar and the Sultan, the express object of which on the part of the former is, to acquire the supreme ecclesiastical sway over twelve millions of Christians of the Greek communion, who are now within the Sultan's dominions, and under his absolute rule. The Christians of other denominations, Armenians, Nestorians, Maronites, Copts, and others, within the empire, are estimated at eight millions. To imply with Mr. Faber and others, that they and their predecessors have for a hundred and fifty years been exempt from the curse of Turkish domination, is to offer the grossest contradiction to fact. Viewed relatively to the improved condition of Protestant Europe during that period, their deprivation of the blessings of religious liberty, and debasement by subjection to an antichristian tyranny, have been and are as great as they were during the three or four hundred preceding years.

That the second woe, which represents the Turkish domination, has not yet come to an end, and that the Turks, therefore, are not the power that is wasted under the sixth vial, is shown also by the fact, that the slaughter and resurrection of the witnesses have not taken place, nor the twelve hundred and sixty years reached their end. The prediction

of their slaughter indicates, that it is to occur at the close of the twelve hundred and sixty years of their prophesying. It is when they would finish their testimony, which is to continue through twelve hundred and sixty days, that the wild beast is to put them to death; and it is at their resurrection after a death of three years and a half, that the second woe is to terminate. But no such martyrdom and resurrection of witnesses have taken place; nor have the twelve hundred and sixty years of their testimony closed. They are still uttering the witness of Jesus against the false doctrines of the apostate church, as earnestly and conspicuously as they have done at most periods for several centuries; and they are likely to continue it, until prevented by violence and slaughter. So far from diminishing, there is probably a greater number now in Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Piedmont, Italy generally, and perhaps even Germany, who would surrender their lives rather than apostatize, than there has been for several generations.

As their martyrdom, then, is to precede the end of the second woe, it results, that the Turkish empire is not yet to fall. There are many, even religious writers, who are speculating respecting the subversion of the Turkish power, as though there were no obstacle to its immediate occurrence; and statesmen, and politicians generally, seem wholly unaware that there is anything revealed in the Scriptures which shows that the time of its overthrow has not yet come. It is clearly indicated, however, Rev. xi. 11–14, that its fall is not to take place till the resurrection of the martyred witnesses. The prophet, after describing their resurrection, ascension to heaven, and the earthquake that followed, adds, "The second woe is past; behold the third woe cometh quickly." The Turkish power is undoubtedly, therefore, to continue for some time to come. It may still farther decline; it may be deprived of some of its provinces; Russia may perhaps retain possession of those it has lately seized; she may possibly even drive the Sultan out of Europe, and compel him to transfer his throne to some eastern capitol; or the empire may fall, and yet its eastern provinces, divided into separate kingdoms, may still continue under Mahometan rule; but that rule over the apostate churches of which it has so long been a scourge, is not entirely to cease, till the wild beast of

understanding of the movements that are in progress, and the issues to which they are tending. Religious and ecclesiastical topics are accordingly discussed by writers of all ranks and all varieties of opinion, both in and out of the church, and with learning, talent, and thoroughness. These discussions give an unusual interest to the periodical literature of the day, and especially to the great leaders of that class—the Quarterlies in Great Britain, which are the organs through which the ablest writers address the public, and which often give clearer, more accurate, and more comprehensive views of these subjects, than can be gained from any other quarter. Several articles of that character in their recent numbers we shall briefly notice, and shall, from time to time, refer to others, as they shall appear.

The article in the London Quarterly of January on the recent work of Count Montalembert on Catholic Interests is of significance in that relation;—the object of it being to expose and confute the hollow and absurd pretences of the count, that the Romish church is hereafter to be the sincere ally of constitutional liberty; the great partizan and defender of religious as well as civil freedom: a pretext put forth there, as it is by the Catholic party here, for the purpose of duping the multitude, conciliating the favor of the rulers, and enabling the church more securely to grasp the supreme power to which she is again aspiring, crush her enemies, and force the whole population into the abject submission and zealous homage she was accustomed to exact from them in former times. The writer gives the following just picture of the sceptical tendencies of the age, and the hopelessness of any reformation of the Catholic church:—

"There have been at times gleams and indications in the writings of divines, and in the administrations of bishops and even popes, that have warmed the heart of the hopeful observer with the idea, that a spirit of spontaneous and healthy reform might in the providence of God gradually permeate the mighty mass of Roman Catholic Christendom. *The urgent necessities of these times,—the undermining of positive and traditional attachments, the gradual decomposition in so many and such various quarters of the fabric of dogmatic belief, the improved tactics of infidelity,* THE REFINEMENT WHICH ITS TONE HAS ACQUIRED, AND ITS SPECIOUS ASSOCIATION WITH A WARM RELIGIOUS PHRASEOLOGY, *all remind us that* NOW, *if ever, those who have faith in Christianity as a creed definitely and unchangeably revealed,* a firm deep-seated *anchorage for the soul,* ought to be at least *drawing nigh to one another under the strong sympathetic attractions of a common interest and cause.* So it ought to be; but let us not follow the wilful philosopher before us, who, in the busy workshop of his imagination, stamps upon something that *he* calls the world, *the*

image he would have it bear. That approximation, or the sense of the need of it, *may be* growing in *individual* minds; but as regards the public tone of communities, the case is otherwise. The *spirit* of unity, the only effective preparation for its form, does not grow in Protestant bodies relatively to one another, nor between them and the great churches of the east and west, nor between these last and one another. *Never were their reciprocal aspects more hostile;* and yet while this is so, *while the wave without is sapping the foundations of the common faith, while the once omnipotent idea of an historical and collective religion incorporated in a visible society is receding from the general mind,* there may yet be heard continually, mocking heaven and bewildering and deluding earth, the loud hollow vaunts of the Roman church and of her hot and sanguine votaries."

These intimations of a wide spreading decay of faith in the Scriptures as a revelation from God, and a rapid diffusion, through all ranks, of a daring scepticism in respect to the truths of natural, as well as revealed religion, instead of transcending, fall, we fear, far below the reality; while it is equally true and indubitable, that not the slightest indication appears in any branch of the church, whether Roman, Greek, or Protestant, of any general and thorough reformation. If the tide of unbelief and irreligion that is sweeping over the nations is to be arrested, it must be by a power immeasurably higher than can emanate from them, and that instead of giving effect to their schemes, shall intercept and put an end to the mischievous agencies they are exerting.

Among the works lately issued that touch on the present and past condition of the church, noticed in these Quarterlies, is Chevalier Bunsen's on Hippolytus, of which the North British has a review that is, in our judgment, much too favorable. The writer indeed limits his assent and praise by a variety of doubts, exceptions, and dissents from principles that are advanced, and results that are reached, and utters hesitating and half stifled protests against the philosophical notions and theories now fashionable in Germany, on which the work is built; yet he, in the main, gives his sanction to what he calls "*the German method of research,*" without fully understanding, we suspect, what the peculiarity of that method is; or seeing how completely foregone the conclusions,—if it is admitted,—are, which they deduce from it. In attempting to define it, he says, "We shall not mistake, we believe, if we express its animating principle to be, *that of reaching Christian truth as it presents itself in Scripture and in history, apart from all dogmatic preconceptions.*" But what are "dogmatic preconceptions" in respect to "Christian truth as it presents itself in Scripture and in history?" Is the doctrine or belief

that the Scriptures are the word of God—an authoritative revel from him—such a preconception? Chevalier Bunsen undoub regards it as such, and rejects and denounces it with the zeal scorn of an indignant partizan. Is the rejection, however, of the i ration of the Scriptures, and of the possibility even of an authorit and permanent revelation in a book, regarded by him and Ger generally of his school as a "dogmatic preconception!" Not at The real peculiarity of "the German method of research after C tian truth" is "that of reaching" it, "as it presents itself in Scrip and in history," apart from all belief that the Bible was written inspiration, or that a miraculous inspiration is possible; and on assumption that Christianity is the work of faculties and proc that are common to all men; and that the religious sentiments faith in the main of the Christian believer are the same in kind those of every other religionist, whether a pagan, a Mahometan, Budhist, a worshipper of idols, of animals, or of deities which intellect and the imagination frame, and station on the mount in the clouds, or in the distant realms of the invisible world. That preconception, undoubtedly, on which Chevalier Bunsen, and fashionable school of Germany whom he imitates and eulogises, ceed; and it is by that, that they reach the conclusion they so ope avow, that some of the most essential and distinguishing doctrines of the word of God are not the doctrines of genuine philosophic Christianity; and that Christianity itself is not a fixed and permanent existence, but progressive, varying, and developed from age to age, into new, widely differing, and even contradictory forms; that with one class it is nothing more than natural religion, or a cold deism; while, with another, it is the crude ritualism and superstition of the Catholic communion. This the writer in effect admits in a subsequent description of their method of searching for Christian truth.

"All know how entirely the living mind of the last century was alienated from the vast scheme of theological doctrine, bequeathed by the preceding, and nowhere so signally or deplorably as in the home of its birth. On the ruins of an equally unchristian and unscientific rationalism, which knew no truth, and cared for none, has arisen the German critical and historical school, of which Schleiermacher, and Neander, and Nitzch, and Dorner, and Muller, besides many others, with our author, are the illustrious representatives; and it became not only natural, but an historical necessity, so to speak, that these men should take up a different position from that of the early Protestantism, to which they yet sought to attach themselves in a new and living manner. It remained no more to build on old dogmatic foundations. It is needless to regret this, even if we were disposed to do so. The task was not *a possible one for these men in their circumstances.*"

and death, in other men who simply regard them as historical realities, or as possibly or probably such. They are themselves, therefore, as absolutely the standard of their Christianity, as the rationalists were of theirs; and they cast their religious system as absolutely in the mould of their natural sentiments, as the rationalists framed theirs after the model of their reason; and they accordingly use as large a liberty as they did in rejecting or modifying the doctrines and facts of the word of God, and substituting others in their place. This the writer indeed, in the very teeth of the commendation he so lavishly bestows on their method, proceeds to admit.

"But while this method of the critical and historical school of Germany possesses *in its conception* such undoubted excellence, it is yet, we must observe, fraught with danger, which is ever apt to run into *the most hazardous extreme*, and which some of its zealous supporters *seem to us by no means sufficiently to estimate. Our author certainly is far from doing this;* and not only so, *but he has laid down favorite views and principles, which*, with all deference, we are inclined to think are so far from being in its genuine spirit, *that they open a door just to return, by another way, to the worst evils of the old dogmatic system.*

"*The danger which everywhere attends the method itself, arises from its very freedom.* The higher criticism which it involves is a two-edged sword, which, wielded by too adventurous or inexperienced hands, may only make havoc, where it intends to restore. The *subjectivity* of the critic brought into such intense play in dealing with the text and meaning of ancient authors, *is ever apt to overrun itself*, and become arbitrary in mere wantonness of power. [It is a still worse fault, that this subjectivity being altogether unsanctified and unbelieving, is a wholly false standard of Christian truth—is, in fact, an antagonistic power, and mistakes and misleads infallibly, whether it "overruns itself, and becomes arbitrary in mere wantonness of power," or not.] Invested with a divining skill, and exercising with such freedom a rehabilitating function, it is obvious what a dangerous eminence he occupies, and what a genuine reverence and judicial sobriety, as well as more erudite discernment, are needed to save him from abusing his position.. And it is here, consequently, as in the very nature of the case it could not fail to be, that the German critical school has fallen most into error, and that some of its most illustrious representatives have exposed themselves fatally to assault. In the actual process of criticism they are apt to substitute mere *feeling—mere subjective arbitrariness*, for sober and well-founded inductions. Even Neander, as a whole, the most deeply and devoutly reverent of them all, has often transgressed here. The hushed and awed humility, with which his great, yet child-like spirit, commonly

dwells within the sanctuary, is not unfrequently laid aside or forgotten *in the intense exaltation of his own personal consciousness*, in dealing with the sacred text.

"*In the volumes before us there are abundant traces of this same undue critical subjectivity.* Relating merely to uninspired documents, it does not indeed ever appear so painfully *as when applied to the sacred Scriptures;* but it assumes sometimes a confidence and authoritative vehemence which are very far from pleasing."

The principle of the two schools,—that the mind is the standard by which the nature and truth of Christianity are to be determined,—is thus essentially the same. They both reject the Scriptures as a revelation. They both reject the great doctrine of redemption by the blood of Christ. The difference between them is, chiefly, that the rationalists openly treat Christianity as a fiction or delusion; the theologists of feeling or emotion frame a vague deism out of their natural sentiments; after the image accordingly of the natural man, and the very antipodes, in its most essential features of the religion of Christ; and endeavor to pass it off on the church as genuine Christianity. The latter is scarcely less false, and is much more mischievous than the former. The scepticism of the rationalist, shocked by its daring and impiety; the specious course of Schleiermacher, Neander, and their school, while betraying their disciples into an equal rejection of the essentials of the Christian system, beguiles them into the belief that they still retain Christianity itself in a purer and more sublimated form, in a cold and faint play of the natural emotions and affections, untransformed into the divine image, and untaught of the Spirit of God. We regret that the North British should give its sanction, in any measure, to so antichristian and preposterous a system.

A writer in the Westminster for April, of far greater knowledge and power, and a disciple of this German doctrine itself, gives a much juster statement of its principles and view of the contrast it presents to Protestantism, and exhibits it as nothing more nor less than Pantheism, moulded by the theory, now so current, of development.

There is another article in the North British for May, on the International Relations of Great Britain, of more than ordinary interest from the picture it presents of the changes that have taken place in the dispo-
n of the nation in respect to war, and its connexion with the states
e continent. The general feeling, especially of the commercial
facturing classes, has become, the writer represents, averse
use of its disastrous effects on their prosperity, and so re-
nothing but a stern necessity could drive a ministry
with any of their neighbors; while from the modifica-

tions which other governments have undergone, they would now be left, should such a contest arise, dependent on themselves alone for safety; not a solitary state of much rank on the continent, he declares, could be expected to act the part, in such a crisis, of an ally. The British are the only people in Europe who now enjoy a representative government. Despotisms reign in all the other states, and their instincts prompt them to repress and overturn the power of Great Britain, rather than to co-operate with and sustain her. Reluctant as they are, however, to plunge again into the vortex of war, he thinks they will not long be able to avoid it, and that but a brief period is to pass ere a large share of the present territorial arrangements on the continent will be broken up, and the races that are now held in bondage, especially in Italy and Germany, be organized under governments of their own.

There is a highly instructive article in the Westminster for July on the Turkish Empire, in which it is suggested that it may be the policy of the western powers—instead of endeavoring to uphold the Turkish government, smitten as it is with incurable decay, or allowing the territory to be divided between the adjacent states—to prompt the erection by the Christian population of an independent empire, or confederation of states, such as Moldavia, Wallachia, Servia, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Albania—which should act independently in regard to their own internal government, and collectively in regard to the affairs of Europe; their integrity and independence being guaranteed by the western powers. The scheme is regarded by the writer, however, as little likely to be carried into effect, and is apparently altogether impracticable. A purely representative government over a single or a federative empire could not subsist for an hour; while an efficient monarchy could not be established there unless by the consent of the Czar, who will never assent to such a measure unless the sceptre is held by a prince of his line, which would be, in effect, to surrender the territory to him. And it is destined, there is every reason to believe, to pass to him, when—probably still at a considerable distance—the time of its change comes.

An article in the Edinburgh, for July, and one also in Blackwood, for August, on China, present much information respecting the present condition of that empire. The former traces the insurrection that has spread over so large a part of the provinces to "the defeat which the proud and boastful government of the country sustained in the war with Great Britain." It was then that the arms were distributed among the people which they are now employing to overthrow their rulers. It was the new and insupportable exactions to which they were subjected, to raise the indemnity

paid to the British, and the intolerable evils that spring from the trade in opium, that drove them to resistance. The English have been greatly disappointed, it seems, in respect to the commercial advantages they expected from the treaty to which they forced the empire, by that war. The amount of merchandise now finding a market there is very little greater than before, when the trade was confined to a single port. The abject poverty of a large part of the population precludes them from the consumption of foreign merchandise. They can, at the best, barely subsist. They have no surplus products to exchange for articles of luxury or necessity. Their power of purchasing commodities from other nations is not greater, in proportion to their numbers, than that of the people of Burmah or Hindostan.

What the issue is to be of the revolution in China is still very doubtful. Little is known of the changes which have been wrought by the insurgents in the provinces which they have overrun; or to what extent, should they prove successful, the government they may establish will be likely to contribute to the well being of the people. It seems to promise the overthrow, in a considerable measure, of the reigning idolatry and superstition, and if it yields no important civil benefits, will, we hope, open the way for a freer intercourse with Christian nations, and an unobstructed proclamation of the gospel.

There is a review also in the same number on the nations of India—for one hundred millions of whom the British parliament has lately framed a government—in which their principal languages are enumerated, and their manners described, and the question is discussed of the feasibility of introducing the English among them, as a common tongue.

Besides these, there are discussions in these numbers on a variety of other important subjects, that are written with learning and ability.

2. The Improvement of the Present State of Things. A Discourse to the Students of Dartmouth College. By N. Lord, President, Hanover, 1853.

The object of this discourse is to state the special [illegible] ends and characteristics of the present dispensation; to show what [illegible] what the prop[illegible] spheres are of religion, of reason, of civilization, and of [illegible] of science; [illegible] int out the unphilosophical and impious character [illegible] of the world, of creatures, and of God, which [illegible] and his own redeemer, and treat the [illegible] ure of this life, as the perfection and [illegible]

which he should aspire, and all that he is destined to attain. The attempts of the shallow speculatists, who are now swaying the general mind, to solve all the phenomena of the universe by the mere light of reason, or the still fainter torch of hypothesis, he lashes with a just severity. So far from any adequacy to the task they undertake, they have not reached such a stage of illumination as to be able to discern the broad line which, like a towering mountain range, separates the territory of mere assumption and conjecture from known and demonstrable fact; or distinguish the narrow limits within which their powers are circumscribed from the all-comprehending and illimitable, which are exclusively God's.

"There has been much adventurous speculation," he says, "concerning the vestiges of creation, and the foot prints of the Creator. But nothing is settled. Nothing can be settled by the natural reason, in regard to supernatural phenomena. They are beyond our limits. We must fall back on the revelations. The disorders of men and of the earth belong to inspired history. Science may investigate, and classify, and describe the facts. God only can resolve them. God has resolved them. The Bible reveals the creation, the fall of man from original righteousness, the curse consequently inflicted upon him, and upon the earth, and all terrestrial creatures, for his sake. There is no other true solution; and whatever professed solution admits not this divine account, lacks the primal and essential element of a sound and comprehensive philosophy."

The attempts of the rationalists of the day to make out a redemption of the race from those evils on the mere ground of nature, he shows to be still more baseless and absurd.

"Whether there is to be a restitution of this disordered scene is equally above science, considered independently of revelation. We cannot predicate deliverance from the curse of sin, and from the consequent evils of a fallen state, of any merely natural agencies. We can only presume it of a possible supernatural interposition. God only, who inflicts the curse, can remove it. A dead body, a dead tree, have no recuperative power, nor a dead soul. There is no known law by which sin, disorder, death, can cure themselves."

But errors in regard to the destiny of the race are not confined to the infidel philosophies of the day. Very mistaken notions prevail also in the church respecting the great scheme of the divine government over the world.

"Whether the present state of things will be materially improved; that is, whether Christian virtue will become characteristic of society in general, during the present αιων of Christianity, so that God shall have pleasure in it, as he had in the original creation, is a question that remains to be drawn out from the confusions and rubbish of a spec-

not a philosopher's stone, but a stone of stumbling and rock of offence to a disobedient and gainsaying people, as Christ has taught us: 'For judgment am I come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind.' We affirm that, whereas during the present age Christ is despised and rejected by mankind in general, in the coming age he will be manifested in glory and majesty, and will bring with him his once afflicted and oppressed people, but now risen and triumphant, and make them like himself, both kings and priests, *and they shall reign upon the earth*, having a wise, righteous, and beneficent authority with him over the residuary nations for a millennium; at whose close this glorified kingdom shall be presented perfect to the Father, and the second resurrection shall take place, 'and death and hell shall be cast into the lake of fire.' But during the present dispensation the ecclesia is an 'election,' not intended to be all comprehending; and all attempts at a universal comprehension are visionary and futile, not consisting with God's everlasting plan.

"These and other related facts, constituting together an illustrious scheme of government, by which the manifold perfections of God will be made known to principalities and powers in the ages to come, according to his eternal purpose by Christ Jesus our Lord, we hold to be the teaching of the Scriptures, in contradiction to the modern speculations. These speculations are not warranted by the philology of the Scriptures, but, on the contrary, are opposed to it; being contrary to those laws of interpretation by which we claim to know the meaning of all other books. They are not warranted by Biblical theology; . . . they are not warranted by history; but, on the contrary, it is evident that the primitive churches never thought of them for a long period. . . . . They are not warranted by the known course of God's moral providence. . . . . They have no claim on any score to canonical authority. On the contrary, we can show where and when, and how they were foisted into the primitive churches, and the churches of the Reformation, and under what patronage, and with what questionable connexions, and spurious pretexts, and injurious results."

We rejoice that there is so authoritative a voice to proclaim these great truths in New England.

3. THOUGHTS ON THE ORIGIN, CHARACTER, AND INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURAL PROPHECY, in Seven Discourses, with Notes by Samuel H. Turner, D.D., Professor of Biblical Learning and the Interpretation of Scripture in the General Theological Seminary, and of the Hebrew Language and Literature in Columbia College. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852.

THE author treats in this volume of the divine origin of Prophecy, of its "increasing development," or the gradual steps by which the great purposes of the Most High are unfolded by successive predictions, of the various modes in which revelations are communicated, of the nature of simile and figure, of the proper rules of interpretation, and of the requisite qualifications of an interpreter. These subjects present a wide field for disquisition, and are discussed with much learning and ability. Many of the topics are very happily presented, and the work is generally marked by the careful investigation, independent judgment, and sound sense for which Dr. Turner is distinguished. The following is his view of the nature of prophetic vision, and may be taken as a specimen of his style:—

"It has already been made sufficiently clear that impressions produced on the mind of the prophet, have to him all the vividness of reality, and perhaps even in a greater degree than outward actions can have by means of the usual bodily organs. The things may be remote in time and place, but to the mind of the divine seer they are present living realities, and are described as such. Stationed, as it were, on an eminence, the prophet sees different points, however distant they may be, in one view. In his rapt mind, he observes before him an outline of the future delineated and portrayed in different degrees of graphic minuteness, the prospect more or less apparently distant, sometimes obscurely marked, and sometimes presented in bold relief, as in a picture; the distant now mingling itself with what is close at hand, now fading away in the remote perspective. He follows the order of appearance, not that of space, or chronology, or history. He is intent upon the scene, and borne along by that commanding influence which fixes his soul upon the prospect. The representation is deeply impressed upon his mind, and when he comes again to his natural condition, he copies what he has seen, and describes what he has witnessed. Any point of particular interest and importance which may have fixed the attention of the elevated seer he brings out prominently by repeated and various representations. The copy, however, is a faithful picture of the original, the description a true account of the fact; but the coloring, the style, *the figures*,— these are peculiar to the writer, and they are modified by the diversity ternal circumstances, which have contributed to form his whole and moral constitution."—Pp. 79, 80.

That the prophet postponed his record or description of the vision till the ecstacy was passed, we think very improbable. It would seem from John's representation of the vision of the rainbow angel—Rev. x.—that he was about to write the utterances of the seven thunders, immediately on hearing them; and was prevented by the voice from heaven;—which shows, as well as the scenes that immediately followed, that he was still in the prophetic ecstacy.

In regard to the meaning of the prophecies, Dr. Turner holds that many of them are charged with a double, that is both a philological and a spiritual sense, and which is much the same, that many of them, especially those that relate to the restoration of the Israelites, are to be explained as chiefly, and perhaps altogether figurative, and relating to the Gentile church. From these views we wholly dissent; and their erroneousness is indicated by the total absence of the clear definitions, the solid proofs, and the conclusive reasonings that appear in the other parts of the volume. Here everything is vague, assumed without evidence, and left without explication. To have established his theory, he should have shown what figure there is that can give language predictions such a meaning; and should have unfolded its nature, proved its reality, stated the principle on which it is used, and made it clear that it gives to the prophecies respecting the return of the Israelites and the rebuilding of Jerusalem, the import which he ascribes to them. Nothing of the kind, however, is presented. The whole is in fact taken for granted. Dr. Turner appears not to have considered that a passage cannot be figurative, except by having a figure or figures in it; that there are no figures but the simile, metaphor, hypocatastasis, and others known to rhetoricians, that have a specific nature, and are used on fixed and well known principles; and that none of them can be the medium of such a meaning as he ascribes to the predictions in question. He writes as though there were besides those, some different and general figure, by which whole prophecies have, irrespective of their philological signification, a figurative or representative function. There is no such figure, however, known to the sacred or any other language. That Dr. Turner does not employ the term, in this connexion, in its ordinary sense, is seen from the passage we have quoted, in which he represents "the figures" of the prophets as the work of their own minds, or as springing from their peculiar temperament and taste. He there undoubtedly uses the word to denote rhetorical figures merely; as he cannot be supposed to maintain that the spiritual sense which he holds lies couched in their predictions, was the invention of the prophets; or that it was owing to their cast of mind that the scenery, agents, and acts of their visions, were employed to express

the spiritual sense which he holds is embodied in their predictions. That would be to make the revelations themselves the work of the prophets, in place of inspirations from the Most High. If there be, then, such a peculiar figure as he assumes, differing from those of ordinary language, why does he not distinguish it by a proper name? Why is not its existence proved, its nature defined, its law stated, and a clear and unanswerable demonstration furnished that it exists in the prophecies in question, and makes them the vehicle of the sense which he holds they express?

But notwithstanding these exceptions, the volume is worthy, not merely of a perusal, but of a careful study. It exhibits much research; presents many sound and excellent views, and everywhere treats the Sacred Word with the reverence and trust that are due to the oracles of God. Among the essential qualifications of an interpreter of the Scriptures, he places a belief in their inspiration.

"Indissolubly allied," he says, to "a true religious character as a requisite for the office of interpreter, is a firm conviction that the prophecies of the Old Testament are of divine origin. It is a very remarkable fact, and particularly exemplified during the last hundred years, that Sacred Scripture has been, to an extensive degree, the subject of critical examination and most learned comment, by men who do not admit the first principles of revealed religion. Men whose philosophy denies the reality, and, in some cases, even the possibility of miracle or inspiration, have devoted their lives to a critical and exegetical examination of that holy book, the authority of which is based on these two principles, which the book itself everywhere avows and claims. The Bible is treated simply as a venerable record of remote antiquity, interesting and important in its bearing on the history and condition of man in past ages, and on his religious, intellectual, and social characteristics. Philological investigation is also one of the various motives which have had influence in producing this anomaly. Learning, taste, genius, and critical acumen, are often displayed in a very high degree by this class of commentators. But they deny that, properly speaking, the Bible is the word of God. They are willing to admit inspiration in some parts of its contents, but it is the inspiration of the poet, or the orator, or the genius, not that supernatural influence of the divine guide which communicates truths that could not otherwise be discovered. Such an influence is denied as unphilosophical. Now, it is very possible that expositors of this class may perceive and explain the true philological meaning of the words commented on; but the very nature of their principles necessarily leads them to invent groundless theories inconsistent with fact, and must frequently warp their minds,

and prevent them from catching the view of writers with whose inward moral nature they have but little sympathy, and whose governing principle they repudiate."—Pp. 139–141.

Unfortunately there are in some of our seminaries men who are very far from regarding a disbelief in the inspiration of the Scriptures as a disqualification for the office of interpreter and theologian; and who take those foreign infidels as their guides, not merely in philology, but in a still higher degree in philosophy and theology, and draw their religion of dreamy feeling and sentiment, from the depths of their own dark and perverted natures, instead of embracing that which God has revealed and enjoined in his word; and the influence they are exerting, doubtless, corresponds to their principles. The sceptical and atheistic doctrines which they have adopted so eagerly from others, it will be found, at length, they are as zealously teaching, and they and their disciples will prove to be as thorough enemies to the Christian system as the great infidel chiefs are whom they take as their leaders.

4. Lectures on Practical Subjects. By the Rev. Henry Melvill, B.D., Principal of the East India College and Chaplain to the Tower of London. New York: Stanford & Swords. 1853.

This volume is marked by the qualities for which Mr. Melvill's writings are distinguished—great copiousness, ingeniousness, and elegance of thought, high graphic powers, and a clear and impressive exhibition of the great truths of the gospel. He has an unusual sway over those whom he addresses. His discourses are so framed that the reader and hearer are made to take a personal interest in the discussion at every step, and like spectators of some great scene, or sharers in some great action, are absorbed in the issue to which they are borne forward, and feel its intimate relations to themselves. In several of the sermons the text is used by accommodation; or the external gifts bestowed on the ancient people of God are treated as emblems of the spiritual blessings conferred on Christian believers, and his dealings with individuals at one period, as symbols of his dealings with his children generally at others. These, if not unobnoxious to criticism, abound with striking thoughts, and display a large knowledge of the lights and shadows that flit across the path of life, the doubts and fears, the sorrows and joys, that agitate the Christian heart.

5. A COMMENTARY ON THE SONG OF SOLOMON, by the Rev. George Burrowes, Professor in Lafayette College, Pa. Philadelphia: William S. Martien. 1853.

THIS volume consists of an introduction, a translation and analysis of the Song, and a comment. Professor Burrowes regards the poem as an allegory of Christ and the church. On that construction, however, the period it represents is not to be considered as the present, in which the church is in thraldom, but that which is to follow Christ's second advent, when he is to reign on the earth; as the saints alone who are glorified, are to constitute the bride; and their adoption into that relation with him, of which marriage is the symbol, is not to take place till their resurrection, acceptance, and investiture with crowns in his millennial kingdom.—Rev. xix. 6–9. And taken as having that reference, it presents in the delicate and fervid affection of the spouse, who is the chief speaker, a beautiful emblem of the awed, admiring, and adoring love with which the risen and glorified will regard the Redeemer; and in the responses of the bridegroom, a lofty and impressive representation of the grace and love which the Saviour is to manifest toward them. The bridegroom and bride are drawn as beau-ideals of our nature; as each undoubtedly was to the other; and instead of fallen beings, may rather be conceived as what such a pair would have been if our first parents had not apostatized:—adorned with all the gifts in their noblest shapes that impart dignity and grace to our race; a quick and comprehensive intelligence; an exquisite sensibility to beauty in all its forms; the utmost delicacy of taste; tender, fervid, and rapturous affections, unwarped by passion, untarnished by sin; and a pure and seraphic delight in each other's society. The unspotted love, the unmingled joy in each other, the extatic pleasure of expressing their mutual admiration and attachment, and the lavish and exquisite imagery in which they clothe their delineations of each other and utter their hearts, form together, undoubtedly, a purer, and more majestic symbol than any other that our world presents of the beauty and grandeur of the union that is to subsist between Christ and his saints, whom at his coming he is to raise from the ruins of death, and exalt to thrones and sceptres in his millennial kingdom.

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME VI. JANUARY, 1854. NUMBER III.

ART. I.—HIPPOLYTUS AND HIS AGE, or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus, and Ancient and Modern Christianity and Divinity compared. By C. C. J. Bunsen, D.C.L. In Four Volumes. London, 1852.

BY THE EDITOR.

AN agent sent from France in 1841, to Mount Athos, to search for ancient Greek manuscripts, succeeded in obtaining a considerable number, which, on his return, were placed in the National Library at Paris. Among them one bearing the title, "On All Heresies," was, in 1851, published at Oxford, as a work of Origen, under the belief that it was a lost treatise of that father on that subject. It was that publication that gave occasion to these volumes. The author's main aim in the first is to show that the treatise is authentic, and instead of Origen, is the work of Hippolytus. He treats in the second of a philosophical History of the Church; and in the third and fourth, chiefly of the ancient creeds, liturgies, and ordinances. His great object, however, is to set forth his own peculiar theory of religion, which is mainly

that of Schelling, Schleiermacher, and Neander, and combat the differing views of the authority and teachings of the Scriptures by the orthodox. He assigns a very high importance to the recovery of the fragment, from the pen, as he supposes, of a conspicuous father of the third century, because of its imagined bearing on that system. He holds that the church, and Christianity itself, is, at the present moment, in imminent danger of worse catastrophes than have hitherto befallen them, and chiefly from the notion long entertained, and still held by most in Great Britain and this country, that the Scriptures were written by inspiration, are a permanent and authentic revelation of God's will, and present a true and perfect statement of Christian doctrine, and delineation of Christian principles and character. He represents that religion exists now in its truest and noblest form, in the German churches that hold his peculiar scheme of philosophy and criticism; and he maintains that the only hopeful method by which other churches can escape the utter shipwreck of their faith and a lapse into atheism, is the adoption of the pantheistic system that is now the fashionable religion of the school on the continent to which he belongs.

"If I have not entirely failed in my efforts to elicit truth out of the records of thought, and out of the annals of history, which are now opened to us for the first time, I owe it to the resources of thought and learning which I have found in the standard works of modern German divinity and philology, and which I have endeavored to apply to this subject. Deeply impressed as I am with my unworthiness to represent either, I still trust to have by this process, and by the very important contents of the newly discovered book, sufficiently shown the real nature and the superiority of the German method of inquiry, and the satisfactory results already obtained. Now if this be the case, I believe also that I have enabled every thinking reader to judge for himself, whether there is much wisdom in ignoring, and whether there be not great injustice and presumption in calumniating the Evangelical Churches of Germany, and in vilifying Germany and German divinity. I frankly own that I have considered it my duty to avail myself of a subject entirely new and fresh, and belonging to the neutral domain of ancient ecclesiastical history, and of a problem which is placed at the same time before the Christian nations, in order to test the real result and worth of what each of them has hith-

erto done in that field of thought and research. The proofs I have given of what has been achieved already, in this respect, by the critical and historical school of Germany, will, I trust, at all events rescue, in the eyes of intelligent and fair judges, from unqualified and unfair insinuations and suspicions, a nation and a church, from which not only the fathers of the English church received the Reformation, but which in the last hundred years have shown a self-sacrificing zeal for Christian truth and doctrine, and fought (alas! only too long single-handed) the good fight for *intellectual and spiritual Christianity*, against the overwhelming indifference of this sceptical and materialistic age. Thus much everybody may easily know and ought to have learned, if he pronounces upon German theology; that so arduous a task has not been undertaken by the noblest and purest minds of a great, although religiously divided and politically torn nation, out of levity, or for the purpose of showing ingenuity and learning, much less out of hatred against Christianity, and that it has not been supported, and in *its principle* accepted, by the people at large, out of infidelity and irreligion. The revilers of German divinity might also know, and ought to appreciate the fact, that the *defects and dangers of German church-life* are chiefly attributable to *the political misfortunes and sufferings* of Germany, not to *the individual or national want of a religious spirit.* The history of nearly a century proves that this attempt to place Christianity upon *a more solid and a really tenable basis* has been undertaken out of courageous love of truth, and that it has been carried on with sacrifices greater than any class of individuals or any nation ever made *to that holy belief*, that there must be truth in history, as well as in reason and conscience, and that this truth exists in Christ and in Christianity. And this faith is so general, and has ever been so powerful in my Fatherland, that I boldly appeal to the impartial judgment of the world and to the infallible verdict of history, in speaking out my conviction, that *there exists at present in no country so much inward, true, sincere, religious feeling and faith in Christ and Christianity, and so much* hope for a better future as to religion, as in Germany, and in Protestant Germany in particular." Vol. i. Pref. xvi–xix.

"The consistent criticism of the Evangelical and Apostolic records does not show that the glorious building of the church was founded upon coals supposed to be gold, or upon sand supposed to be rock, *but it certainly does prove that it was erected in too contracted proportions both for its divine founder, and for humanity to last for ever.* The apostolic and ancient church [church being put for the doctrines, rules of life, and worship of that church, as they are recorded and enjoined in the New Testament] is no more absolutely normal

than any other; still it bears evidence not only negative, but most positive, of the comforting fact, that it agrees in all essential points with that which philosophical and historical criticism of Christianity must call the truth. Thus the modern critical and historical school (in which I do not mean to include the theology of Tubingen and the philosophy of Young Hegelianism in their peculiar negative and partly destructive views) has not found in Christianity less truth than its predecessors, but more; and it must and will finish, not in weakening, but in strengthening Christianity. In judging its development and errings, it must not be forgotten that the critical school of Germany found Christianity almost given up in the conscience of mankind, beyond some good moral truths or some solemn rites. It is a historical fact that it has kindled a light both in the history and the philosophy of Christianity, and shown a power of life in Scripture, of which the former irrational method had no idea, no more than the Magian has of spirituality, or the fabulist of history."—Vol. ii., pp. 111, 112.

The representations that have so long been current, and with German writers not less than others, that infidelity and atheism are very prevalent in Protestant as well as in Catholic Germany, are thus, according to Chevalier Bunsen, egregious calumnies. There is no other people within the circuit of Christendom, so truly religious and Christian as the Germans. They have been rescued from the abyss of scepticism by a few of their own authors; and the great instrument by which they have been restored to faith, and raised in understanding, trueheartedness, and fervor, above all others, is the German method of "philosophical and historical criticism." Some doubt, however, is thrown on the import of this statement, by the intimation that the Christianity that now prevails in Germany, is not identically the same as that of the apostolic age, and is not to be judged by the doctrines, rules of life, and spirit of the church of that period, as they are embodied in the New Testament, any more than it is by the faith and practice of any other. Whether the present religion of Germany is of such genuineness and worth, depends, therefore, on the sense in which the terms religion and Christianity are used. If they denote nothing but a species of naturalism, based on a false and dreamy philosophy of God and man, and a cold admission of certain historical facts, construed according to that philosophy, that is little less

sceptical in respect to all that is essential in the Christian system, than the rationalism which it professes to reject; it is but little entitled to the high estimate which the Chevalier places on it, and gives but a faint claim to those who embrace it, to be regarded as the disciples of Christ. What, then, is the nature of this new species of religion which the great originators of the German philosophical and historical method of treating Christianity, have called into being? What is their philosophy of God and man? And what is their critical method of determining what truly belongs and what does not, to the Christian system? These are questions of much interest here as well as abroad, from the fact that many among us are disposed to accept the scheme which Chevalier Bunsen advocates as the really philosophic, and, therefore, the only true form of genuine Christianity. We apprehend it will be found, on examination, to have very little of the religion of Christ except its mere name; that in all its essential elements, it rejects the teachings of the Bible and substitutes in their place the wild and impious scheme of modern pantheism; and that the method by which he attempts to support it, so far from having the high merits which he ascribes to it, is altogether empty and deceptive.

I. What, then, is the critical and historical method, on which he relies so confidently, of determining what does or does not belong to the Christian system? He speaks as though it were not only new and peculiar to the modern Germans, but were absolutely infallible. No mistake, however, could be greater. That method, as it is practically employed by those who profess to follow it, is nothing else than the use, by each one, of the principles and results of his philological and historical investigations, to verify and support *his own peculiar philosophical theory or dogma*, and overturn that which is opposed to it. It is not itself the criterion of truth, nor an absolute rule for discovering it; reason or consciousness is everywhere made the great test of truth and of fact, and the critical method is the mere instrument of verifying what is held to be the voice of reason or consciousness. Philology and history, accordingly, are no more necessarily or uniformly used by the school to which Chevalier Bunsen belongs, to maintain the truth, than they are by any other class of inquirers. Whether they are used legitimately

or not, depends with them, as much as with others, on the nature of the doctrine they are employed to sustain. If that doctrine is false and antichristian, they are perverted by them to the support of error, as truly and as directly as they ever are by any other false teachers. What a modest pretence that they are the only parties who make an impartial use of their knowledge of language and history, to discover and establish the truths of religion! That he makes reason and conscience, or consciousness, the test of religious or theological truth, is seen from the following passages:

"The supreme judge is the Spirit in the church; that is to say, in the universal body of men professing Christ. *The universal conscience is God's highest interpreter.* If Christ speaks truth, his words must speak to the human reason and conscience, whenever and wherever they are preached; let them therefore be preached. If the Gospels contain inspired wisdom, they must themselves inspire with heavenly thoughts the conscientious inquirer and serious thinker; let them, therefore, freely be made the object of inquiry and of thought. Scripture, *to be believed as true*, with a full conviction, must be at one with reason; let it therefore be *treated rationally*. By taking this course we shall not lose strength; but we shall gain a strength which no church ever had."—Vol. i., p. 172.

He thus assumes that reason and conscience, *as they are exercised by men*, are infallible tests of theological truth; that the word of God is to be tried by them; that its teachings, if true, will accord with theirs; and that they are, therefore, to be regarded as true, so far as they coincide with the actual reason and conscience,—that is, *the speculative notions, the judgments, and the feelings of men on religious subjects*,—and no further. This, which is taught in other passages, and is a cardinal element of his system, is the same theory as that of Schleiermacher, Neander, Morell, Parker, and Newman, who, with the Chevalier, denying the inspiration of the Scriptures, make the consciousness, reason, or judgment of men, the standard of theological truth, in place of the word of God.

This being the view on which he and others of his school proceed, the critical use which they make of philology and history in their investigations, is to verify the speculative or philosophical theories of God and man which they have

framed under the guidance, as they profess, of their reason and consciousness; not, irrespective of those and other theories, to ascertain what it is that is taught in the sacred word respecting God, the nature and condition of man, and the government which the Most High is exercising, and is for ever to exercise over him. They are no more impartial; they are no more exempt from sinister biases; they no more keep clear of false and absurd hypotheses, than other classes of inquirers.

This is exemplified by Chevalier Bunsen's course in the work under notice. The use he makes in it of philology and history, is simply to confirm the peculiar philosophic and theological system, which he represents himself as having for many years entertained, and corroborating the opinions he has long held respecting the speculations, doctrines, and practices of the church in the early ages. To this end he exhausts all the resources of his learning and ingenuity. Nothing is omitted either of assumption, conjecture, argument, or declamation, that can give a color of probability to his views. So far, however, from having settled any of his chief points satisfactorily, he has at best only invested them with an air of likelihood; and his main one, that the fragment of which he treats, is the work of Hippolytus, instead of commanding the assent of his own party, is distinctly rejected by several writers of his school, as familiar with the critical and historical method of the Germans as he is, and rejected for reasons, we presume it will be generally thought, quite as specious and imposing as those which he alleges to support his views. The authorship of the tract is no more determined than it was before. There is only a fuller statement of plausible conjectures and slight probabilities of its origin. It is a question, indeed, that in the present dearth of means, does not admit of a demonstrative determination. A faint probability is all that can be attained respecting it.

Nor is Chevalier Bunsen withheld by the critical and historical method of investigation, from mere arbitrary assumption and *à priori* reasoning in regard to theological truth. So far from it, he makes his "dogmatic preconceptions," or arbitrary speculations respecting the Divine nature, man, and the universe, the very basis of his interpretation

of language and theory of history, and builds on them his whole construction of the sacred Scriptures, and of the dogmas and practices that have prevailed in the church. Instead of judging of the teachings of the Bible, and the doctrines and life of the church, by philology and history, he interprets language, doctrines, and events, by his preconceived philosophic theory of God and his works. Thus, his philosophical aphorisms, which are the principles of his system, are presented as deductions from an analysis of the mind, and as the result of pure speculation, in contradistinction from evidence; and among them are the following, in which he represents the threefoldness of the Divine nature, not as a trinity of persons, but as consisting simply of existence, thought, and the consciousness that he that exists and he that thinks are the same; or God as a mere being, God as acting and manifesting himself, and God as that in which he is manifested; in which man is exhibited as God in a visible and finite form. He says:

"If the infinite be the necessary cause of the finite, the key to the knowledge of the finite mind must be in the infinite mind. Now, as religion implies avowedly a connexion between God and man, the realities concerned present at first sight a twofoldness, God and Man; but, in fact, a threefoldness, God, Man, Humanity, or mankind. Or in other words: God as manifesting himself in and through man, manifests himself in a twofold character,—as the infinite cause of the individual man, and as the infinite cause of humanity.

"Such a twofold manifestation, not being reducible to the peculiar nature of the finite, implies as cause, a twofoldness in *the primities, eternal self-manifestation of God.* Now the analysis of this twofoldness, as *constituting the Divine mind, in infinite self-manifestation*, has given us the following Triad:

i. Existence.	Thought, (Reason.)	Consciousness of the Unity of Both.
ii. God	Word	Spirit
as	as	as
The Absolute Being.	The Eternal Manifestation in God.	Eternal Consciousness of Unity.—Vol. ii., p. 43.

This trinity then, instead of persons, consists only of being, thought, and a consciousness that the thought is the act of

the being who is conscious of it. This he holds, however, is, in fact, but a duality, not a trinity. In the trinity which he ascribes to God, he represents man or humanity as occupying the third place:

"The Triad of God manifesting himself in the universe through man, or the Triad of the Infinite in the process of realization in time, is this:

GOD. MAN. HUMANITY.

"If the threefoldness thus arising out of the union and co-operation of the infinite and finite, is demonstrably only the reflex of that ideal process of the self-consciousness of the divine mind, the metaphysical or ontological Triad is proved to be the necessary prototype of the finite reality, and the key to the threefoldness of God in religion.

"Man is in the finite; that is to say, in the visible universe, what the thought (or logos) is in the infinite divine mind; and humanity is to the individual, what the consciousness of the unity of existence and thought is to God, *the complete form of the divine manifestation.* For humanity, as such, does not exist in bodily reality; neither is it only the aggregate of individuals, for it has a principle of evolution independent of the individual. It can therefore only be explained by its organic reference, both to man and to God; to man, so far as he is the apparent reality of humanity; to God, as the eternal cause of all. The development of humanity has, therefore, its real centre in the eternal self-manifestation of the divine mind. In the divine mind the complete self-consciousness of *unity* pre-supposes the existence having been made objective by thought (the objectivation). Thus in the demiurgic process of the divine mind, humanity pre-supposes man.

"The second, or demiurgic threefoldness, God, man, humanity, *is the great reality in which the human mind finds itself placed;* and it is this threefoldness, as based upon the eternal divine self-manifestation, which religion, or the God-consciousness in man, necessarily exhibits."—Vol. ii., pp. 44–45.

The third element of this triad is thus, humanity, or the sum-total of mankind; it is this sum-total of mankind accordingly, that is the object of the consciousness which he puts in the third place in the other triad, and denominates the Spirit; and thence, as God can be conscious only of himself, implies that mankind are God himself in

a finite form; and that what he calls the Spirit is, in truth, only God embodied and self-conscious in man. He accordingly says, "The Spirit has not had, and is not to have, any finite *individual* embodiment. It appears in finite reality only *as the totality or universality of the believers*, or the congregation of believing mankind, called the church. But this spirit is substantially, not the spirit of any human individual, or of any *body* of men, but the Spirit of God himself." And this is Schelling's doctrine, that God the Absolute becomes self-conscious only as he unfolds himself in the form of man; which implies that the sum-total of his self-consciousness, and the sum-total of the consciousness of mankind, are the same.

The philosophy of Chevalier Bunsen is thus the pantheistic theory of Schelling; and it is on that that he proceeds in the whole of his critical and historical researches in the work under notice. It is the avowed object of his philosophical aphorisms to state and sustain this system; and a main object of his critical and historical remarks on the doctrinal and speculative views of Hippolytus, to show that they, in a measure at least, accord with it. Instead, therefore, of being an independent and impartial inquirer after truth, implicitly following the guidance of philology and history in the search after it, he begins by propounding as the result of an *à priori* analysis of the mind, a philosophy of God and man, which determines his whole system of theology, and then employs all his critical resources to give support to that system. And this is what he complacently calls, "the method of inquiry," "which the critical and historical school in Germany pursues," and it is, in fact, as characteristic of them as a body as it is of him. Thus Neander did not reach his pantheistic development theory of God and man, through his *philological and historical investigations.* Instead, he adopted it from Schelling and Schleiermacher, and made it the great aim of his historical researches to confirm it, and cast the history of the church in the mould of that theory. His philology and history, consequently, in place of guides to his faith, were mere instruments to confirm and exemplify the speculative notion he had previously adopted on mere *à priori* grounds. Moehler, on the other hand, proceeding on essentially the

same development theory, employs his knowledge of man, of language, and of history, to prove that the Roman Catholic is the genuine form of Christianity, and he is as specious in his reasonings, and as confident of the truth of the results which he reaches, as Schelling, Neander, and Bunsen, are in theirs; while Strauss, entertaining a still different notion, has directed all his critical powers to the support of the theory that Christianity has, in fact, no foundation, either in reason, revelation, or history, but is a mere congeries of myths, embodying the vague fancies and hopes of men in the early Christian ages; and his scheme is just as much the result of his philological and historical investigations, as theirs is of theirs. They are alike designed merely to embody their several previous speculations, and give them an air of support from philology, history, and philosophy.

And finally, this view of their method of inquiry is confirmed by the diversity of the results which are reached by those who profess to follow it. Were it such an infallible guide to truth, as Chevalier Bunsen represents, it might be expected that those who pursue it, would agree, substantially at least, in their construction of language, and their views of the facts of history. No such concurrence, however, subsists among them. While they proceed on essentially the same views of philology, they diverge into the widest differences in their interpretation of the Scriptures. Neander, for example, rejects nearly the whole of the miracles of the New Testament, and puts on its narratives just what construction suits his philosophic theory, without any regard to the laws of philology; while others of the school hold that they are to be acknowledged as much such miraculous works, as the language of the sacred writers represents them. Bunsen, in like manner, though entertaining essentially the same theory of historical development as Schaf and Nevin, reaches wholly different results respecting several of the doctrines and rites of the Romish church, and denounces as consummate errors, what they regard as genuine elements of the Christian system.

The lofty eulogies which Chevalier Bunsen bestows on the critical and historical method of investigation pursued by the Germans, are thus altogether misplaced. So far from being a safe guide to truth, in the manner in which they employ it

it only "leads to bewilder, and dazzles to blind." It no more necessarily or naturally conducts to just inductions, than a minute acquaintance with other branches of knowledge secures such a result in their spheres. It only enables them to take comprehensive views, to gather a great array of facts that seem to corroborate their theory, and to invest their speculations with a demonstrative air; precisely as a large knowledge of the various branches of the natural sciences enables those who cultivate them, to give an imposing aspect of truth and demonstration to the theories which they entertain respecting them. The extensive studies and observations, for example, of Sir Charles Lyell in the field of Geology, enable him to take a general view of the causes that are now producing changes on the surface of the globe, to give specious solutions of many effects that have been wrought in past ages, and to allege a great and showy array of considerations that appear to sustain his theory of the formation of the present crust of the earth. His large knowledge, nevertheless, instead of leading him to the truth, is misapplied to the support of a theory that is felt by many of the highest rank in his own profession, to be not only without any adequate evidence, but to be in contradiction to many of the most conspicuous and important of the great facts with which he deals. The author of "The Vestiges of Creation," in like manner, has swept over a wide field of inquiry, and gathered a large stock of facts; but in place of being led by his scientific knowledge to the discovery and reception of the truth, he employs all the resources of his ingenuity to pervert it to the support of a theory that presents the most bald and repulsive contradiction alike to the facts of which he treats, and the principles of science by which he professes to be guided. And in precisely the same way the high culture of philology, and the laborious and minute investigation of history for which the school to which Chevalier Bunsen belongs are distinguished, in place of conducting them to the truth, in fact only prove the means, by enabling them to take large views of the course of events in the world and church, to form specious hypotheses of the nature and origin of opinions, doctrines, and practices, and to gather a more imposing array of facts that give apparent corroboration to a preconceived theory that is alike at war

with God's nature and ours, with the teachings of his word, and with the dictates of consciousness; and that instead of supporting, would strike from existence the whole fabric of Christianity.

II. We have already shown that our author's philosophy of God and man is the pantheistic system of Schelling. It may be satisfactory to the reader to have some further proof of that fact. He gives his assent in the following passage to the great principles and doctrines of the atheistic and pantheistic philosophies that prevail at present in Germany.

"To discern a universal, true, and positive, not negative solution, of the problem of the philosophy of history, may be said to have formed, and to continue to form, unconsciously and consciously, the ultimate object of that great effort of the German mind, which produced Goethe and Schiller in literature; Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, in philosophy; and Lessing, Schlegel, and Niebuhr, in critical philosophy and historical research. . . . Kant unfolded in his critical review of the faculties of the mind, the idea that positive religion *presupposes reason*, and manifests a form of *eternal truth*; thus throwing down for ever, so far as philosophy itself is concerned, that baneful and godless wall of separation, which has deprived history of its holiest historical characters; philosophy of its most sublime object, religion; and divinity of nothing less than divine reason. Fichte and Schelling abolished the distinction which Kant, in his positive system, had established between theoretical and practical reason; and the latter insisted upon the acknowledgment of an identity between the mind and the world, as the two sides of one and the same divine manifestation. It is unnecessary to show how the history of mankind, and consequently the history of the human mind, were exalted by this view; and how speculation was driven from abstract formulas into the reality both of nature and history. . . .

"Whatever may be thought of the peculiar reconstructive speculations of the masters of this German school, it is a fact that their criticism of the philosophy of the mind has restored the principle of free and responsible agency, and of the primitiveness of reason and faith. In accomplishing this, they have thus done more than any other school to restore the inward reverence for religion, and a belief in the higher destinies of mankind. It is this school especially which has vindicated inward religion from the materialism and scepticism of the philosophers of England and France, and has formed in Germany an invincible bulwark against that theory of human life which has crept into the thinking minds of those countries."—Vol. ii., pp. 24–26.

But Kant expressly denied that we have, or can have, any knowledge or evidence of the divine being, or of an external universe; and by representing the mind itself as the cause of all its sense-perceptions, cut off all the means of connecting ourselves in any way with God: and thereby rendered religion absolutely—except as a delusion—impossible. This was amply demonstrated by Fichte, and is admitted now, we believe, by writers generally; and the result was that the Germans, in crowds, became speculative atheists. But that was a very awkward position for men in the ministry and in the chairs of the universities especially, who were obliged, in order to the exercise of their offices, to assent to the creed of the national church. It was a very unsatisfactory state also to those who, having received in a measure a religious education, or being influenced more by their reason and conscience than by shadowy speculations, found it impossible to elude the conviction, which is perpetually forced on the mind by the external universe, of the being and government of God. Efforts were accordingly soon made by Schelling, Schleiermacher, and others, to escape from this embarrassment, by constructing a philosophy that recognised God and religion as realities. What, then, was the process by which these philosophers undertook "to restore the inward reverence for religion, and a belief in the higher destinies of mankind?" Not the rejection of the theory of Kant in regard to the cause of our sense-perceptions, which denies the possibility of a knowledge of God through any external media, such as the universe, or a spoken and written revelation demonstrated by its own nature and by miracles to be from him. For they adhere to that theory, and in accordance with it, deny that there are any external evidences either of the being of God, or the truth of Christianity, and disown the fact and possibility of an external miraculous revelation. But the method they took was, to put God in the place that, in Kant's system, is occupied by the understanding and reason; or, in other words, to exhibit God, whom they hold to be the only intelligence and only agent in the universe, as being himself in a finite form, the soul of each individual man, and thereby making his reason and conscience God's, and all his religious dispositions, principles, and acts, acts and revelations of the divine reason and will. And, finally, to

give completeness and speciousness to this philosophy, the theory of development was devised, by which mankind as a race, or the "totality" of human beings, under the name of humanity, are exhibited as an individual person passing through a process of unfolding, correcting, and maturing his powers, and purifying and exalting his character, till he shall finally reach absolute perfection. All the theologies and philosophies that have risen and prevailed from age to age, are accordingly held to be parts of this great movement, and of a truly religious and divine character. Christianity, in the shape in which they admit a few of its ideas, is exhibited as the last and highest form of this development, and as the natural outgrowth of previous theologies and philosophies; or as produced by a fusion of the Hebrew theocracy with the Greek polytheistic theology. This system of naturalism they have endeavored to mould into a seeming harmony with some few of the great teachings of the sacred word, such as the unity and trinity of God, the fall of man, deliverance from sin, and a final redemption of the world; and on these grounds they claim that it is the genuine and only true form of Christianity.

Thus after assuming God's existence and government of the world as generally admitted facts, the Chevalier proceeds to construct a philosophy of him and his works, in a series of aphorisms. We transcribe a few passages in which he presents the great elements of his theory:

"The object of thought of an infinite being, can only be thought itself as existence. We are thus obliged to distinguish in God the consciousness or thought of himself (the ideality) from his being (the reality). Thus we come first to the original twofoldness of the infinite being. His thinking himself by an eternal act of will, is identical with his establishing in his being by this spontaneous act, the distinction of subject and object: the subject being Reason, the object Existence, as such, as distinct from Thought.

"But that divine act implies at the same time, the consciousness of the ever-continuing unity of Subject and Object, of Existence and Reason.

"Thus there is implied in the one thought of God, a threefoldness centring in a divine Unity.

"In its finite realization, this divine threefoldness of the mind reflects itself both in the psychological process, by which a perception or notion is formed in the human mind, and in the logical process, or in

the formation of a logical proposition. Man cannot think himself, without first acknowledging in himself the difference of the subject (he who thinks), and of the object (he who is the object of the thought), and at the same time without being conscious of the unity of his being. It is only thus that he knows that the subject and the object are identical, and it is by this consciousness alone that he is in his senses. . . . .

"In order to prove that this psychological fact has an *ontological reality*, and is THE SUBSTANCE OF THE DIVINE MIND, Schelling and Hegel have employed a metaphysical chain of reasoning. There is, however, *another method of establishing such a proof*, by showing that all that we know of the finite realization of mind, viz. Man, and Humanity, *bears such a witness of this truth as to* OBLIGE US to suppose that a unity or threefoldness exists in the Divine mind."—Vol. ii., pp. 33, 34.

He thus defines the threefoldness which he ascribes to God, not as belonging to his substance, or being of the nature of personalities, but as a mere distinction between his being, his act of thinking of himself, and his consciousness of his identity in the two relations of an existence and an intelligent agent. Yet he pronounces this threefoldness "an ontological reality" and "the substance of the Divine mind," and avers that we are obliged to admit it, because such a threefoldness is predicable of the human intelligence, which he holds is a finite realization, or embodiment of the Divine mind, and a perfect model of its nature. He accordingly proceeds to show that man himself is God in a finite form:

"As there exists a creation, it is evident that this outward manifestation of God must be connected with that inner or immanent process. In the same manner as the eternal Being manifests himself in this self-consciousness as thought, and as unity both in existence and thought, the Divine mind in the creation must be supposed to *reveal* himself in a twofold reality.

"The thought of God of himself is a making objective the eternal subject: indeed, the creation of this universe is a continual objectivizing of subjectivity, and thus the reflex of the immanent Divine process, applied to the finite.

"The primitive antithesis in God (God and Word), applied to the creation in time and space, or considered with respect to the demiurgic process which terminates in man, may be denoted as that of Father and Son. The Son may in this respect also be called the eternal Thought of God.

"In every human soul there are consequently two factors; *th finite, as far as the soul is a part of the self-consciousness of before all finite existence;* and the finite, as far as man has the im diate or nearest cause of his existence in another created being, (in the first instance) in the agency of an elementary power earth. . . .

"The nature of the *finite* factor, in generation and developm can be explained by the nature of the parents, the tribe, the nati character, the language, the spirit of the age, the climate, educa events, and all concurrent external circumstances. But the *in* factor is the enigma of every man's existence. It is incalculable inexplicable, as everything which is not finite, and not the wor finite causes. So is every one that is born of the Spirit! . . .

"The highest degree of power of the infinite in man is, that soul has in itself the consciousness, and by an unselfish self-sacrific manifests the working of that *divine element* which is in him. This as far as it is real, *an incarnation of holiness*, and, consequentl second birth or new creation.

"As far as moral perfection is concerned, such an elevatio human life into the divine can never be separated from the responsible ethical action, which alone constitutes virtue, and al gives ethical dignity. But this action *is not the action of man as s* that is to say, of the *finite being*, as far as it is striving to become the centre of existence, and fancies itself its own cause as well as its own end. It is the action of THE INFINITE *factor in him, working undisturbed a life in God.* This antithesis of self and God, in the highly gifted mind, corresponds with what is theologically called, the difference between nature and grace."

"The following table shows the harmony of the Semitic expressions with the Japhetic terms of the philosophy of the mind:

Original Process of Creation.	Reproductive Process of Ethic Action.
GOD.	MAN.
MATTER. MIND.	INSTINCT. MIND.
Conscious Bodily Existence.	Conscious Embodiment of Mind in Nature.
GOD IN MAN.	GOD'S WORK IN MAN.
	THE TRUE. THE GOOD. THE BEAUTIFUL.
	SCIENCE. SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS. ART.
	FAMILY. STATE. CHURCH."

—Vol. ii., pp. 35–38.

He thus represents the soul of every man as "a part of the self-consciousness of God before all finite existence," which—as the soul is not an act but a being, and as God is self-conscious of nothing but his being and acts—is expressly to assert that every one's soul is a part of God's being; and he accordingly calls it "the infinite," "the infinite factor," and "the divine element" in man, and affirms that "the highest power of this infinite in man is, that the soul has in itself the consciousness of that divine element;" or in other words, is aware that it is a part of the divine Being, or God in a finite form; and this he calls "an incarnation of holiness." He describes the original process of man's creation also, as the production of matter and mind in a conscious bodily existence, and defines the result as God in man. Though wrapped up in a cloud of obscure words, his philosophy thus is, that man is but God in a finite form.

This doctrine he presents again in the following aphorisms, in which he teaches that the threefoldness which he ascribes to God, is that which is denoted in the Scriptures and the writings of the early fathers by the personal names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

"The Triad of God manifesting himself in the universe through man, or the Triad of the Infinite in the process of realization in time, is this—

God. Man. Humanity.

"If the threefoldness thus arising out of the union and co-operation of the infinite and finite, is demonstrably only *the reflex of that ideal process of the self-consciousness of the divine mind, the metaphysical or ontological Triad is proved to be the necessary prototype of the finite reality, and the key to the threefoldness of God in Religion.*—Vol. ii., p. 44.

God stands for the Divine Being, considered as the or "before all finite existence." Man stands for or God thinking; that is, in an active and con-, which, according to the theory, is the only form God exists in a conscious state; and Humanity the totality of God's activity and consciousness; he whole sum of the thoughts, emotions, acts,

and consciousness of the whole of mankind. This he proceeds to show in the following statement:

"Man is in *the finite*, that is to say, in the visible universe, what the Thought (or Logos) is in *the infinite divine mind:* and Humanity is to the individual what the consciousness of the unity of the Existence and Thought is to God—the complete form of the divine manifestation."—Vol. ii., p. 44.

The three formulas of the Triad which he has given, viz.:

1.	EXISTENCE.	THOUGHT (reason.)	CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE UNITY OF BOTH.
2.	GOD as the absolute Being.	WORD as the eternal manifestation in God.	SPIRIT as eternal consciousness of Unity.
3.	GOD	MAN	HUMANITY

are thus the same, varying only in the relation in which they are contemplated; the first being exhibited in the abstract, and the last in the concrete, the form in which, according to the theory, God actually embodies himself; while the second is only a definition or explanation of what is meant by the others. The first he calls "the metaphysical or ontological Triad;" the last, "the demiurgic threefoldness."

"The demiurgic threefoldness—God, Man, Humanity—is the great reality in which the human mind finds itself placed; and it is this threefoldness, as based upon the eternal divine self-manifestation, which Religion, as the God-consciousness in man, necessarily exhibits."

"The ancient Scriptural and apostolical doctrine of Christianity is that of Father, Son, and Spirit, substantially united. This doctrine is placed, so far as the first element is concerned, by the side of the strictest doctrine of the Unity of God. So far as the second, the Son, is considered, it always refers to Jesus, the Christ, *and to believing man.* Lastly, the Spirit is always treated with reference to the community (Ecclesia), or to believing mankind. But, at the same time, He who is the Son, is called the incarnation of the Eternal Word. In like manner the Paraclete is considered as the Spirit coming from the Father.

"The following three points may, therefore, here be assumed as proved; because every one may easily ascertain this simple fact, by

comparing the genuine Scriptural passages which form the apostolic *tradition* on the subject.

"First, The Unity of God, as the eternal *Father*, is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity.

"Secondly, The *Son* is Jesus the Christ *as the adequate manifestation in the highest sense:* every true believer is Son, in a state of diminishing imperfection, being brother to Christ in the Spirit. But Jesus alone is the incarnation of the Word (Logos). He, therefore, is called by St. John the only begotten.

"Thirdly, *The Spirit* has not had, and is not to have, any *finite* individual embodiment. It appears in finite reality only as the totality or universality of the Believers, as the congregation of believing mankind, called church. But this spirit is substantially, not the spirit of any human individual, or of any body of men, but the Spirit of God himself.

"This is the statement of the Bible; and to accept and believe this statement as the revelation of Divine truth, and this alone, forms the doctrinal test of the apostolical age.

"Those who accept that Biblical statement, who profess this belief before the congregation, and who lead a Christian life accordingly, may freely reason and speculate upon the connexion of Father, Son, and Spirit, with dialectic thought and metaphysical reasoning."—Vol. ii., pp. 46, 47.

That is, those who admit a threefoldness in God, and use the terms Father, Son, and Spirit to express it, may entertain whatever speculative or philosophical views they please respecting its *nature*. The mere acknowledgment of a threefoldness of any description, and use of those personal names to distinguish it, is all that is involved in the profession of Christianity, and all that is necessary to entitle them to a place in the church!

"The creed of the churches, the baptismal pledge, is substantially nothing but the response to the formulary of immersion, Matth. xxviii. Whoever admits and professes the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, in the *words* of that apostolic tradition respecting them which is contained in the Bible, is an orthodox Christian; and if he teaches it, an apostolic teacher; and all churches which exhibit and realize that statement are apostolical churches.

"Thus far the fathers and churches of the second and third centuries are unanimous and apostolic; and this faith and *this liberty* constitute their importance to us."—Vol. ii., p. 47.

He holds, however, that they are of no consideration any farther, and admits that, in fact, they knew nothing of that species either of metaphysical or demiurgic triad, which he ascribes to the Deity, and uses the terms Father, Son, and Spirit to designate.

"Beyond that simple but grand faith, and beyond this truly Christian principle of liberty [of holding any theory that a speculatist pleases, if he only uses Scriptural terms to express it], they neither pretend to apostolic perfection and authority, nor do they indeed exhibit a perfect state of development.

"In their theological reasonings on the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, the second and third centuries do evidently not distinguish sufficiently between the statement of the Bible (as it were the historical statement) [and in which the trinity is exhibited as a trinity of persons], and the speculative and philosophical element [which exhibits it as consisting only of a Being and his acts]. Nor do they always distinguish, with sufficient clearness, between what belongs to the ontological Triad, which is the self-consciousness of God of Himself within Himself; and the demiurgic Triad, which is the manifestation of the Divine mind in the Finite, or God, Man, Humanity. Lastly, they do not attend sufficiently to the difference between *the Eternal Thought* of the finite manifestations [*i. e.* the Divine purpose and prescience] and its realization in time and space." —Vol. ii., pp. 47, 48.

That is: They were wholly unacquainted with his philosophy of God and man: his theories of the trinity were as wholly foreign to them, as they are to the Bible.

Such are the great elements of his boasted philosophy of religion. Instead of a philosophy, however, it has not, as the reader must have seen from the mode in which it is announced, the slightest trace of a scientific and demonstrative system. He scarcely makes a pretence, indeed, of proof. His aphorisms are mere statements of his *à priori* assumptions and speculative notions; while his analysis of mind in God and man, which he parades so ostentatiously as a profound discovery, and makes the basis of his whole system, is marked by an inconsideration, superficiality, and erroneousness that are wholly discreditable to one who makes any pretension to a knowledge of metaphysics. To say nothing of the uninquiring and *à priori* manner in which he virtually

assumes that no diversity of persons exists in the Divine nature, which the names Father, Son, and Spirit, may be employed to designate; the metaphysical or ontological threefoldness which he ascribes to God, is not, in fact, a threefold, but a mere twofoldness, or the distinction between God considered as a mere Being, and considered as an agent "thinking of himself, within himself;" for God's consciousness of his identity in those two relations, which the Chevalier makes the third element in the Triad, is plainly as purely an *act*, and an act of which he is himself the *object*, as the "thinking of himself, within himself," is, which is put in the second place in the series. If "thinking of himself, within himself," comprises a perfect comprehension or view of his Being and agency, as the Chevalier will doubtless maintain, it must, of course, comprise his consciousness of his identity as Being and agent. The third element of the Triad, in place of a peculiarity, is thus but a particular act that is embraced in the all-comprehensive knowledge or agency that constitutes the second. But if such an act, that is but one of a general class, is entitled to be considered as constituting a distinction that may properly be designated by a personal name, and exhibited as a personal agent, as the Holy Spirit is in the Bible, how much more may other acts of the Deity, such as will, power, love, command, displeasure, justice, mercy, which are wholly different in their nature from the act of thinking or contemplating himself, be entitled to that distinction? On the principle on which our author proceeds,—that a species of acting, such as self-thought or self-comprehension, and self-consciousness or a perception of his identity, is to be considered as constituting a distinction in God, answering to those denoted in the Bible by Son and Holy Spirit,—instead of limiting those distinctions to a Triad, he should have held them to be at least as numerous as the attributes are—intelligence, power, will, love, displeasure, justice, mercy, and all others that God, in fact, exerts in his all-comprehending agency. How admirably this shallow quackery which thus marks his system answers to the lofty pretensions he makes of a scientific analysis of the subject; an "insight" that amounts to the highest species of inspiration; a revelation unveiled to him by a light flashed directly from the Infinite Reason! Yet the

merit of inventing, even this wretched specimen of German philosophy, is not due to Chevalier Bunsen. It had its origin with Schelling, and was long since made familiar to English readers, by the greatest, most hollow, and most mischievous of these sham philosophers—Coleridge, who attempted to pass off the stolen bantling as the progeny of his own genius. Can it be that these writers were so superficial, or so hallucinated, as not to see that their lauded analysis is a sheer blunder? Dreamers as they were, we cannot think it. Instead, we deem it far more probable that the sham was got up with its air of profound research, with a perfect comprehension of its emptiness, for the mere purpose of giving their philosophy an apparent concurrence with the great Scriptural doctrine of the personal trinity in the Godhead, and enabling them thereby to mask and dignify their system, with the name of philosophic Christianity.

III. The new and improved species of religion which these speculatists have called into existence by their critical and historical method of searching after truth, consequently, instead of the religion of the Bible, is a mere naturalism, masked under doctrinal and historical names, that are drawn from the Christian system; and is the product of mere *à priori* and lawless speculation, without a single element that retains the form which belongs to it in pure Christianity. Its God, considered as a mere being, or the Absolute, is an essentially different being from the Jehovah of the Bible. Its Logos, Word, or Son, is God in a finite form in man, and not exclusively in Jesus Christ, but only eminently in him as a perfect man; but measurably also in all other men, who, it teaches, are also God in a finite, though imperfect form. Its Spirit, instead of a divine agent, is the totality of human beings in God become finite and conscious. Christ is a Redeemer accordingly, not by making an expiation, but only by presenting a complete exemplification in himself, first, of perfected human nature, and of devotion to the good of men; and next, of the redemption from the evils of sin and death, of which men are to be made the subjects. He is the simple Greek beau-ideal of human nature deified, or a god of the Greek mythology. Thus, our author says:—

"The belief in incarnation is the full acknowledgment of the Hellenic idea of heroic dignity, divested of the fetters of physical ne-

cessity and fable. The Christian idea of incarnation appears in St. John and St. Paul, *entirely independent of any preternatural procreation.* The philosophical or infinite factor is the principal, and may be the original."—Vol. ii., p. 115.

This is a direct assertion that, according to John and Paul, there is no appearance that Christ's conception by the Virgin was miraculous, or that he was not the son of Joseph, as other men are the sons of human fathers.

"The consciousness of Christ himself, and his expressions about it, form the divine and historical groundwork for the metaphysical exposition contained in the words of the prologue. This is the indestructible basis, inaccessible to any doubts of historical criticism, of the Christian doctrine of the Son, and of the whole second article of our faith. *His life and death of self-devotion for mankind as his brethren, and as children of God, form the historical seal of that grand revelation.*"—Vol. ii., pp. 114–115.

"The second factor of revelation is the finite, or external. This means of divine manifestation is, in the first place, a universal one, the universe of nature. But in a more especial sense, it is a historical manifestation of divine truth through *the life and teachings of higher minds among men.* Those men of God are eminent individuals who communicate something of eternal truth to their brethren; and as far as they themselves are true, they have in them the conviction that what they say and teach of things divine, is an objective truth. They, therefore, firmly believe that it is independent of their personal opinion and impression, and will last, and not perish, as their personal existence on earth must.

"The difference between Christ and other men of God is analogous to that between the manifestation of a part, and of the totality and substance of the divine mind. It is Semitically expressed by the distinction between Moses and Christ. . . . Or in other words, the Christian religion is a manifestation of the very centre of God's substance, which is love; it is the revelation of the Father by the Son, who is the incarnation of the Eternal Word, and without sin."—Vol. ii., pp. 64, 65.

Christ is thus, according to him, only the highest among those higher minds, who are the great philosophical and religious teachers of the race, and his death was only an act of self-devotion for mankind, and "an historical seal" of the truth of his doctrines, in the same sense as theirs is, when they submit to martyrdom by their enemies for their doctrines.

His scheme, consistently with this rejection
ment, disowns also all the other great doctrines of the go
such as regeneration by the Spirit, and justification by f
His religion is a mere speculative notion or natural fee
and is represented by him as in reality but an instinct.

**"Man as an intellectual being has the inward consciousness
ruling divine Will and Reason, as the first cause or Ruler of the
verse, and of the intimate and immediate connexion of his own
and Reason, and his whole existence with the same. *This imme
consciousness is called religion*, or in German, *consciousness of
The religious consciousness, or religion as perception and feelin
in man as an intellectual being, *exactly what* INSTINCT, or *the percep
of the outer world* in its relation with the animal life, is in *the ani
creation.* The religious consciousness may therefore be called
highest instinct of humanity."—Vol. ii., p. 53.**

This is essentially the definition that is given by Schel
Schleiermacher, Morell, and Parker, and is the lowest
cies of naturalism that can be devised. It makes religi
mere constitutional perception and feeling that belongs to
man as an intelligence, and does not necessarily involve any
piety or virtue whatever, any more than any other unavoid-
able or natural perception and emotion. No renovation, no
spiritual influence; no revelation from God, is necessary to
produce such a religion. He accordingly rejects the Scrip-
tures as an inspired revelation. The Greek and Roman
poets, philosophers, and historians, were as real and as au-
thoritative prophets, he holds, as the writers of the Bible.
The natural reason, instincts, and affections are made the
supreme criteria of religion, and its very substance; and,
consequently, all the false speculative ideas of men, all their
constitutional appetites and passions, and all their selfish and
unhallowed thoughts and acts, are legitimatized. For as all
the ideas, instincts, emotions, and acts of the mind, are ex-
hibited as the ideas, instincts, and acts of God, how can they
be supposed to be in antagonism to his character and viola-
tions of his will? By the system he has no written code for
the guidance of men; he has no external law; he has no
will but that which is manifested through their speculative
notions, instincts, and inclinations. The supposition that

any of their principles, inclinations, or acts are violations of his will, is, therefore, a self-contradiction. If these philosophers who profess to have analysed the mind of God and man, and gained a perfect comprehension of the nature of religion, have not seen far enough to discover this, it indicates an extraordinary hallucination. There is not one in a million, probably, among the feeblest of their disciples, who has not perspicacity enough to see at a glance, that if he is himself God in a finite form, and his ideas, instincts, emotions, and acts, are the ideas, emotions, and acts of God, it is impossible that he can violate the Divine will, or incur the Divine displeasure by any acts he exerts. He is of necessity made by the scheme his own supreme master. Being his own cause, his own law, and his own judge, how can he be subordinate to or responsible to any other? The most unrestrained license is necessarily given by the system to all the natural passions and affections of the mind, and sin in its most debased and atrocious forms invested with the name and merits of the most unspotted righteousness.

This horrid caricature of Christianity is accordingly the religion which flourishes, Chevalier Bunsen represents, among the Germans, and constitutes them a more sincere, believing, and pious people than any other! It is undoubtedly the religion, or rather the negation of all religion that prevails there, and is the reason of the lawless passions with which so many of them are inflamed, and which threaten, as he confesses, the speedy precipitation of both the church and state into an abyss of anarchy.

Yet on this hideous system, more demoralizing than any other that was ever devised, he relies for the reformation of the nations and the redemption of the world. He admits that religion is now nearly extinct in Europe, and that society is hastening there to a violent dissolution.

"All the movements of the last three hundred years, tend towards a fearful dilemma; either a serious, judicious, conscious reform must be made in the Christian community of Western Europe, or the dissolution of the fundamental elements of society will be effected by social revolutions. There are countries even now, where socialism is the only sign of constitutional and religious life in the consciousness of the people. Socialism, however, is nothing but the demoniacal caricature of the original Christian Association, reflected by the con-

cave mirror of hatred against the selfishness, luxury, and ... worship of the higher classes. Christianity saved the old world fr... this misfortune, by bringing the elect through faith in God and m... into a new world; but the passage lay over the ruins of exist... states and civilization. The ancient world perished by the birth-thr... of Christianity; ours, if not reformed, will perish by convuls... attending its decay."—Vol. iii., p. 210.

His hope, however, of their being reformed by the influen... of his pantheistic system, will be disappointed. It is th... and the rationalism with which it is associated, that generat... the frightful lawlessness and impiety that prevail through... Germany, and it necessarily precludes their reformatio... The prayer of Christ for his people, "Sanctify them thro... the truth; thy word is truth," expresses the great law of t... Spirit in the renovation of men. How, then, can they b... sanctified through the truth of the divine word, who wholly reject that word, and regard it with hatred and scorn? It impossible. Their utter unbelief is an insuperable barrier t... proper conviction of their sins, or even a knowledge of th... moral ruin. They must cease to be infidels before a pos... bility can exist of their reformation. Their unbelief insures their continued irreligion, therefore, and thence their destruction either by their own hands, or the avenging judgments of heaven. It is a great law of God's providence that nations that apostatize from him, shall be left to follow their false and impious principles to their natural results, and learn themselves thereby, and show to others in what fearful demoralization and terrible miseries they necessarily issue. And such a procedure is demanded by his holiness and his wisdom. He cannot consistently treat error as though it were truth, and use it as the instrument of reformation. He cannot, compatibly with his wisdom and sanctitude, crown atrocious sin with the meed of the purest virtue. His rectitude requires that he should, in his administration, discriminate the evil from the good, and cause each to meet the rewards that answer to its nature. And such is the course of his providence. We see in the demoralization of Italy, Spain, and Portugal, the natural results of their impious faiths and debasing superstitions. The infidelity of the French gave birth to the savage passions and demoniac atrocities of the revolution, which soon proceeded to such an

extreme, as to impel the government to re-establish religion, in order to save the nation from utter self-destruction. And the hour is not remote, we apprehend, when the rationalizing and pantheistic infidels of Germany will be allowed to exemplify in an equal tragedy of horrors, the true character of their impious principles. When in the next revolutionary tempest that sweeps over the west of Europe, the nations among whom these doctrines prevail, extricate themselves from the thraldom in which they are now held, and seizing the supreme power, wreak their brutal and demoniac passions on their oppressors and on one another, it will be seen what the real character is of that human nature, which these shallow dreamers now deify; and into what a gulf of anarchy and blood they naturally plunge those who yield themselves to the sway of such impious speculations.

Art. II.—The Rev. Albert Barnes's Notes on Revelation xx. 4–6.

By the Rev. H. Carleton.

In a previous article we showed that the objections of Mr. Barnes to the grammatical construction of Revelation xx. 4–6, were either palpably absurd, or that he had himself given satisfactory answers to them. In a refutation of his reasons for the rejection of the rendering of the passage, which derives from it the doctrine of a literal resurrection of the saints, at the commencement of the millennium, we supposed that there would be no need of examining what other opponents of the doctrine have written, for he evidently had consulted other authors, and especially the writings of Mr. Brown, who is treated as *the* champion of anti-millenarians; and, moreover, he manifestly intended to introduce every important topic which could be urged to sustain his views.

We now propose to show that the passage does teach a literal resurrection of the pious dead, and that it will not admit of any other interpretation.

There is frequently a difficulty in framing an argument to prove that the literal or obvious construction of language

gives the true sense or meaning of the author. The difficulty is the same that a man would encounter who should, in a clear day, at noon, attempt to prove that the sun shines, or that it was not midnight. The fact would be more obvious than any process of reasoning, however clear or indubitable. So the suggestions of an interpreter often bewilder the mind, simply because the meaning of the author is so plain and obvious, that an attempt to make it more certain, only "darkens counsel by words without knowledge."

But an effort has been made to prove that Rev. xx. 4–6 does not, by a grammatical construction, teach the resurrection of the pious dead, and that the language will not admit of a literal raising to life of the body. It is proper that these suggestions should be met.

In determining the import of any writing, it is very important that we keep in mind the sentiments of the contemporaries of the writer, so far as they relate to the subject of which he treats, how he might reasonably have supposed his language would be understood, and how it was understood, especially by those who believed that what he wrote was true, or who claimed to be his disciples, or to fully sympathize with his views.

What, then, were the sentiments of the contemporaries of the writer of Revelation, or more especially of those who first received his writings, and what did they suppose he taught who believed that he was inspired by God to communicate things to come? We are aware that it may be affirmed, that we have no knowledge of the views of the Christian church respecting the resurrection of the saints, and their reign with Christ on earth, at the time when the book of Revelation was written, aside from what may be derived from the Scriptures. But it must be admitted that it is probable that very many at least did believe that the saints would be raised, and reign with Christ on the earth, and it is certain as history can make it, that the early readers of the writings of the apostle John believed that he taught the doctrine. It will be profitable here to consider the following facts:

1. The Jews did believe that the pious dead would be raised, and would reign with the Messiah on the earth. We trust this statement will not be disputed.

2. The disciples of Christ sympathized with the Jews fully in this opinion, up to the time when he was taken up into Heaven. This statement we trust will also be admitted.

3. There is no account given of a change of sentiment on this subject, up to the time the Revelation was written.

4. The entire orthodox church, early in the second century, in less than fifty years after the death of John, believed the doctrine.

5. The early Christians did believe that John taught in Rev. xx. 4–6, that the saints would be raised at the commencement of the millennium, and would reign with Christ a thousand years. When in after times this doctrine was rejected, its opponents rejected the Revelation also, as an inspired book, because it taught it. And from that time to this, it has been more than hinted that millenarians first found their sentiments in the passage under discussion.

It is inconceivable that the church should have abandoned this doctrine, and then revived it again, in fifty years. It is contrary to the whole history of human opinions, that they so readily re-adopted an opinion which they had themselves discarded. And besides, the apostles themselves, and many early Christians, did not abandon the hope of the reign of the righteous on earth with Christ very readily. It had for a long time been cherished in the Jewish church. It was identified with the resurrection itself. It was as a first truth in the minds of the disciples, when they imploringly inquired, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" Surely this sentiment could not have been abandoned unless there had been an express and clear declaration from God, that it was false, and therefore should be rejected. On no other ground can we suppose it was given up, especially by the Jewish converts, before John wrote the Apocalypse. It is presumed that no one will affirm that anything is left on record which would show that the doctrine was false, a fiction of worldly-minded Jews. No one will affirm that the Scriptures anywhere expressly teach that it was of man and not of God;—a plant which God had not planted, and therefore must be rooted up. We will not here affirm that the apostles did not give the churches, founded under their ministry, instruction which is not recorded in the Bible. Yet, as the Scriptures are the only rule of faith, we can

hardly suppose that important truths were communicated to the first churches, not taught in the Bible.

Let us now take another point in history. In less than fifty years after the death of John it was universally believed by the orthodox church that the saints would be raised up to reign with Christ on the earth. Admitting, then, that we have no certain knowledge respecting the sentiments of the church, relative to this subject, during the hundred years between the day of Pentecost, and the time when Justin Martyr wrote; how shall we be able to account for the fact, that the whole orthodox part of the Jewish church, embracing even the disciples of our Lord, at the commencement of this period, and the whole orthodox Christian church at its termination, did believe that the saints would be raised up to reign with the Messiah; if, during this period of a hundred years, Christians believed the Scriptures taught no such doctrine, but that it was a Jewish fable? If this were fact, it cannot be proved from the Bible. If it was a fact that the apostles, being inspired of God, instructed the Christians to reject the doctrine, it is unknown to us. So far as we know anything on the subject, it was retained in the church until a vicious method of interpreting the sacred writings was adopted. On no known principles of human character, developed in the history of opinions, should we imagine that this belief was abandoned and re-adopted in so short a time. It must have required a long time for Jewish converts to separate it from the resurrection of the saints; and we have not the least reason to suppose they would have done it, unless by the most direct instruction on the subject, given by inspiration. Would it then so soon become a test of true faith, or orthodoxy in the church, after having been abandoned, with a severe struggle, and in consequence of express instruction from heaven? Indeed, we must believe that the doctrine continued in the church; was in it when John wrote. We must believe that when John wrote to the churches, "And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years;" very

many of them, if not all, believed that the time would come when Christ would appear the second time, and that then the righteous dead would be raised up, and they would be glorified with him on earth. How then must they have understood what he wrote? What meaning would they, yea, what meaning must they have given to his language? Must they not have been confirmed in their previous opinion? Is not the language employed by the sacred writer appropriate to give a full and clear enunciation of the doctrine? And was it not in accordance with the custom of our Saviour (for John only gives his messages to the churches) when he wished to rebuke an error, to use the language which the believers in it would employ as the most appropriate formula to express it?

But admitting that the doctrine respecting the resurrection of the righteous to reign with Christ on the earth, had ceased to exist in the church, and was revived again immediately after the Apocalypse was written, on account of what is contained in that book, and especially the passage under discussion; the same conclusion must follow respecting the literal or obvious meaning of the language. We suppose it to be a fact that no one will dispute, that the earliest writings of the Christian fathers show that the Christians who lived in the next generation, subsequent to the death of John, did believe that he taught in Rev. xx. 4–6, that the saints would be raised up to reign with Christ a thousand years. This fact is affirmed. And moreover, in later times, when through the influence of the allegorical method of interpretation, introduced by Origen and others, the doctrine was rejected; its opponents attributed its existence, or its perpetuity in the church, to the Apocalypse, and consequently rejected the book as destitute of divine authority. We know, therefore, how this passage was interpreted by those who lived near the time when it was written, when many were alive who were contemporaries of the apostle, and had listened to his instructions. We know that there was but one sentiment in the orthodox church respecting its meaning. We will not here urge this fact to prove the doctrine true. We will not here mention that it is surprising that since the erroneous interpretation (if it be erroneous, and so hurtful as is now affirmed by its opponents)

must have been given immediately after the book was published, either John, or those religious teachers who must have been instructed by him, did not rebuke it, and thus rescue the passage from abuse. We will not set down as incontrovertible, a universal opinion of the orthodox church, at the time when the last of the apostles was scarcely cold in his grave; of the church in its purest days, and at the time when the oral instruction of the living and inspired teacher confirmed and explained what was committed to writing, respecting the true import or meaning of a passage contained in the New Testament. We will only say that such an interpretation would determine the question respecting the language, the words, or terms employed. This point, we believe, is always conceded, and it is all that we contend for in this place.

We come now to an examination of the terms employed by the sacred writers, and shall maintain that the passage does teach that the saints will be raised up and reign with Christ a thousand years, if the literal or obvious interpretation gives the true meaning of the author. Let our position be understood. Under this head we shall not attempt to show that while a literal resurrection of the saints is described, they are not introduced in a risen and glorified state, to represent men who shall live in mortal bodies. We will endeavor to discuss that point in another place. We shall in this place point out what is described, and shall attempt to show that it is a resurrection of the bodies of the saints in a glorified form, and not a reanimation in a mortal form, nor a resurrection of souls disconnected from the body, nor partly one and partly the other, but yet neither, but an "as if" the souls of the martyrs lived in the bodies of men who should live at the time indicated by the "thousand years."

The sacred writer says:—"And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark in their foreheads or in their hands, and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

It has been objected that this passage cannot refer to the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, because it is said, "I saw the souls, . . . and they lived." Mr. Barnes urges this

objection with great confidence. He says, "by no possible construction can it mean the bodies of the saints." And yet he has fully shown in his comments on Acts ii. 27, that this objection can have no possible foundation. He says there is no clear instance where נֶפֶשׁ (Heb.), ψυχη (Greek), is applied to the soul in a separate state or disjoined from the body, and in the phrase, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," he says, "This expression refers to the dead Messiah. Thou wilt not leave him among the dead, thou wilt raise him up." There are instances where ψυχη is applied to the soul only, or as distinct from the body. But it certainly accords with Scripture usage to designate men by the word souls, to speak of the death of men by saying the soul died, when it is certain that only the death of the body is meant; and of their living, or being preserved alive, when the life of the body only is referred to. We will only refer to a few passages. "Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls." Acts vii. 14. The passages where persons are designated by the word soul, are very numerous, as any one will readily discover by consulting a concordance. "Oh, let me escape thither! (is it not a little one?) and my soul shall live." Gen. xix. 20. "He hath delivered my soul in peace from the battle that was against me." Ps. lv. 18. "Let my soul live, and it shall praise thee." Ps. cxix. 175. "Behold for peace I had great bitterness, but thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption." Isa. xxxviii. 17. "And they smote all the souls that were therein with the edge of the sword." Joshua xi. 11. Many other passages might be referred to, but these will be sufficient to call the attention of the reader to a usage which is very common. In these passages persons with souls and bodies united, are called souls, and in most of them there is a special reference to the body, although the word soul is used. Mr. Barnes says, "By no possible construction can it (ψυχας, souls) mean bodies of the saints." If it be properly said "they smote all the souls that were therein," when it is only meant they smote the bodies; "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption," when the life of the body is meant; "And my soul shall live," when reference was had to escape from natural death; why cannot ψυχας, in Rev. xx. 4, have, in

like manner, a special reference to the bodies of the saints? Certainly common usage favors such a construction. We trust that we shall be able to show that this construction is not only admissible, but necessary.

The language in this passage is such as is employed in the sacred Scriptures to describe the resurrection of the body or its deliverance from death, and is never used in a restrictive application to the soul in a separate state from the body. The Scriptures do not teach directly that the soul does not die, but assume the fact. They do not teach that the soul, distinct from the body, is raised from the dead, or lives again after it has died; for the continued, uninterrupted life of the soul is always assumed, unless those passages are to be excepted which relate to the assertion of the truth against the infidelity of the Sadducees. And even then the resurrection is the principal theme of discourse.

On the other hand, the Scriptures do speak of the deliverance of the soul from the grave, from death, where the meaning is either that the body is raised up or preserved from death. And, indeed, wherever dying, or living, or deliverance from the grave is predicated of the soul, the meaning is, that the body dies, and the soul is consequently separated from it, or the soul is reunited with the body, or the union of the soul and body is preserved, and consequently the body lives. We are confident that the more carefully this position is examined, the more manifest its truth will appear.

The Scripture usage is indicated in passages already quoted. We will refer to two more texts, in which a resurrection of the body is clearly described.

"But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave." Ps. xlix. 15. In this Scripture it is quite obvious the doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous is taught. If, however, some of those modern divines who cannot find the doctrine of the resurrection taught in the Old Testament, should affirm that this is a disputed passage, they must admit that the deliverance has respect to the body, and not to the soul, distinct or separate from the body. If the resurrection of the body is not declared, then its preservation from death is taught.

"My flesh also shall rest in hope, for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." Ps. xvi. 9, 10. The doctrine of the resurrection

is here certainly taught, whether modern divines believe, or disbelieve, that it can be found in the Old Testament.

We have here a Hebrew parallelism:

Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell;

Neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

The law of Hebrew parallelisms is, that the fact announced in the first part, is repeated in the second, with perhaps an additional idea. In this passage the addition is, that the Messiah should be raised before the body began to decay, that is, soon after death. The fact of the resurrection of the body is asserted in both members, for this is the principal theme. Accordingly, when it is said, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell," the object is to declare a literal resurrection of the Messiah.

It should be remembered that in Rev. xx. 4, the writer does not simply say he "saw the souls of them that were beheaded," but that he saw them, and "they lived." Since, therefore, when living is predicated of the soul, a living in the body is meant; the meaning here must be that John saw the bodies raised to life again, by the reunion of the souls with them. Nor should it be thought strange that such language should have been used to announce the resurrection of the righteous; for the resurrection of Christ, who was the "first fruits of them that slept," was predicted by the same substantive term, and a predicate in no respect more clear or unambiguous. We are prepared to say that no language could have been more appropriate to describe a literal resurrection than that found in Rev. xx. 4–6. Nay, it is the very language which the sacred writers had used when speaking of the life of the body, or of the soul living in the body. It is in substance the same language used in foretelling the resurrection of Christ. It was the language which would occur most readily to the mind of the Christian when he would prove to the unbelieving Jew that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah, because he died and rose again, according to the Scriptures. It is something more than simply uttered. It may with reason be supposed to have been proverbial in a form of speech used for a particular purpose.

There are other facts which show that the language in this passage describes, when interpreted according to its obvious import, a literal resurrection.

The Revelator says, "and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded," &c., "and they lived." That is, they lived in respect to that in which they had been dead. Is it said that the apostle meant to teach that the soul did not die? Mr. Barnes seems to intimate that he thinks this the meaning of the writer. He paraphrases "they were put to death in the body, but their *souls* were seen to be alive. They had not ceased to be, but they lived and reigned with Christ *as if* they had been raised up from the dead."

The first of these sentences would seem to indicate that the apostle designed to assert that the soul did not die, as had been feared. The same idea is suggested in the first part of the second sentence, but in the last member a resurrection is asserted, or an "*as if*" resurrection, which is predicable only of what had died, and not of what had not died. We will not affirm positively, any meaning of this passage from Mr. Barnes, for he says and unsays the same thing; and yet at least when he began and wrote the first sentence and the first part of the second, he seems to have designed to give an interpretation of the language of the sacred writer which would make him teach that the soul did not die or cease to be. But this idea is not in the passage, nor was it at all the object of the writer to assert that there was not a death. The fact of a death is asserted, not of the soul indeed, but of the body; and the main design is to teach that those would live, who were dead, and that they would live in respect to that in which they were dead. And this is admitted in the last member of the last sentence quoted above from Mr. Barnes, and in other sentences which we shall have occasion to refer to. If there is not sufficient evidence to be found in the fourth verse, that a resurrection or raising to life of that which had been dead, is taught, instead of a continued existence of the life of the soul, the question may be fully settled by referring to the 5th and 6th verses. From what is said in the 5th verse, it appears that the living again of a part of the dead is described in the 4th verse, and in the 6th verse what the Revelator affirms in the 4th verse, he saw, is called a resurrection.

This point established, that a resurrection is described, the next inquiry is, whether it is a resurrection of the soul or of the body.

Mr. Scott thinks John saw in vision the resurrection of the soul. We are not aware that Mr. Barnes has interpreted the language of the apostle, to mean a resurrection of the soul. He does indeed paraphrase the passage, as if he thought it taught that the soul did not die when the body died, but he immediately admits that the language appropriately describes a resurrection. But to recur to the topic now under discussion, we inquire, did John see in vision the resurrection of the soul or of the body?

Did the soul die? Was the soul beheaded? If the soul was beheaded or died, then, perhaps, the resurrection of the dead carcass of the soul! (νεκρος, see v. 5), was raised up. But where in the Bible are we taught that the soul dies? Nowhere, certainly. And besides, some of those who "lived and reigned" had been beheaded, for the witness of Jesus. This was done by men, by the enemies of God. This violence was committed upon the body, and not upon the soul, for, according to our Saviour, men can only kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. See Matt. x. 28. Hence the body only had died. If any reader should think we trifle, we can only say it is necessary to meet the opponents of millenarians on their own ground. If they assume, that the passage teaches a resurrection of the soul, and with an air of triumph say ψυχας "can by no possible construction mean bodies," and if the Christian public think their position unanswerable, we must show that the souls of the saints did not die, were not beheaded, and consequently were not raised out of a state of death.

Since, therefore, those who lived and reigned with Christ lived in respect to that which had died, and since the body only had died, a raising to life again of the body is clearly indicated by the language. We think no other construction can be put upon it. The idea of a dead soul, or of a dead soul raised to life again, is nowhere to be found but in the imagination of those who would oppose some fact taught in Scripture. But it may be said that it is not meant that the soul died and was made to live again, but that the apostle saw in vision the souls of martyrs transferred to other bodies, and what he saw was a symbol of those who should live during the thousand years specified. But the idea of the transmigration of the soul is not found here, nor does

the language describe a semblance of it, for that would not be a living again. (See v. 5.) It would be a soul living in a body, which had not before existed. It would not be a resurrection (see v. 6), but a bringing into existence something new to be joined with that which had never died.

If any one still thinks the passage affirms a resurrection of the soul in some sense, and not of the body, we would suggest that this cannot be, because we learn from the fifth verse that those who "lived" were a part of the dead, the νεκροι. If those who lived not were one part of the whole number of the νεκροι, then those who lived were the other part. To use a favorite expression of the late Professor Stuart, "one leg of the compass is as long as the other." "The rest of the dead lived not again." Therefore one part of the dead did live again, at the commencement of the thousand years. Those lived who died, and in respect to that which had died. According to Greek usage, νεκρος means a dead body. This is the true meaning of the word. And if the souls, in the place of spirits, are sometimes called οι νεκροι, it is in allusion to the fact that their body is dead. When, therefore, it is said the dead (νεκροι) lived, the meaning is, they were reanimated, by a reunion of the soul with the body which had died. Especially is it the meaning when it is said οι νεκροι, the dead, lived again. Moreover what is described in the fourth verse, is called a resurrection in the sixth verse. Now, if the language in the passage under discussion does not describe a literal resurrection, how shall we understand the following passages? "Of the hope of the resurrection of the dead (νεκρων) I am called in question." Acts xxiii. 6. "And have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead." Acts xxiv. 15.

Is it still objected that the word resurrection is not used in the 4th and 5th verses? An answer is ready. What is described in the 4th is called a resurrection (αναστασις) in the 6th verse. And by comparing the 4th, 5th, and 6th verses, it appears that it is foretold that a part of the dead should live again, should be raised from the dead.

Notwithstanding, Mr. Barnes thinks the language cannot be made to describe a literal resurrection. He says: "They

lived and reigned with Christ as if they had been raised up from the dead." And how were they to live *as if* they were raised up from the dead, unless the language would appropriately describe such a resurrection? Again, he says: "The meaning then, so far as the language is concerned, must be that there would exist at the time of the thousand years a state of things *as if* the martyrs were raised up from the dead." We suppose that he thinks there is a clear indication that the passage is to be considered an allegory, because the word souls is found in the text instead of bodies. But in the allegories of our Saviour, the fact which is made a symbol is literally described. In all of his parables there is to be found a most accurate and pleasing description of the symbol. We do not know that what he says is an allegory, because of the language employed, or because of a mixture of figurative and literal language, but from evidence independent of the description itself. It is not generally considered to be according to good usage to make the language partly literal and partly figurative, *i. e.* to make some of the words descriptive of the symbol, and some of them descriptive of what is symbolized. The allegory and the interpretation are to be kept distinct, else the language will be obscure, ambiguous, incapable of a certain interpretation. We do not here deny that this passage is an allegory, but what we affirm is, that it contains a description of a literal fact. And, indeed, Mr. Barnes admits it; for if, so far as the language is concerned, the thing predicted is, "*as if*" the martyrs were raised up from the dead, then it would follow that we find in what the sacred writer has said, a literal resurrection described, a living again of the soul in a body. Now, unless Mr. Barnes will say that his "*as if*" the martyrs were raised up is, *as if* their souls transmigrated into other bodies, he must, we think, admit that it is "*as if*" their souls were reunited to their own bodies. And we make no question that this is his meaning, for we cannot think he supposed that the sacred writer introduced, as a figure, the heathen notion of transmigration. His idea undoubtedly is, that the resurrection, literally described, is not a resurrection in immortal bodies, but mortal, such as the martyrs had in this world. Now, if this be the meaning of Mr. Barnes, he admits that the language, when taken

literally, does describe a resurrection,—a reanimation of the body that was slain or had died.

Thus far we have endeavored to determine the meaning of Rev. xx. 4, when interpreted according to the most obvious sense. And we think it must be admitted that the prophet saw in a vision a literal resurrection of the bodies of the saints, or martyrs. This Mr. Barnes admits, although he probably supposes that the body was seen to be raised in the same mortal state which it was in when it died. Accordingly, there is no good reason for the interpolation of "*as if*," so often used by our author.

The question now arises, is the passage to be considered an allegory, a prediction of the character of those who will live during the millennium, under the form of the resurrection of martyrs or saints who have died? Or is it to be regarded as having its ultimate and sole reference to the resurrection of the saints in immortal bodies, so often taught in the Scriptures?

If the passage is an allegory or teaches one fact under the form of another fact, which has or will occur, or which may be supposed to occur, then we may presume some clear indication was given, that this was the design of the writer. It is not usually considered necessary to prove that the grammatical construction gives the true sense of the author. But Mr. Barnes thinks we are notified that a literal resurrection cannot be made out of the passage, because the word souls is used instead of bodies. But he admits that the passage contains a description of a literal resurrection as literal as that contended for by millenarians. If the word souls makes it impossible to construe the passage to mean a resurrection of the body, it does not show that the passage is allegorical, but that it teaches a resurrection of souls. If by interpreting the language literally we find in it an account of a resurrection of the body, notwithstanding, it is said, "and they (the souls) lived," then certainly a resurrection in glorified bodies may as well be understood as a resurrection in mortal and dying bodies. So, after all, there is, according to Mr. Barnes, no indication in the passage itself that it is an allegory. Now, if it simply predicts a resurrection of the saints without determining whether they will be raised in mortal or immortal bodies, it is certainly most

natural to suppose the apostle speaks of a resurrection often mentioned in the Scriptures rather than of one of which no mention is anywhere made. If, therefore, there were no peculiar reasons connected with the passage under discussion, or the context, for adopting the grammatical as the true sense, yet, following the laws of interpretation, we should be constrained to do it, in opposition to any other which might be suggested.

There are many reasons which prove that the apostle, in this passage, has taught the literal resurrection of the saints.

We have already seen that the language is such as is employed in other parts of the Bible, in teaching, or affirming a belief in, a resurrection of the righteous, and especially such as was used by the prophet in predicting the resurrection of Christ. It will be unnecessary to repeat the same remarks here, which have already been made on this topic. We will only add that since similar phrases are used only to indicate the union of the soul with the body, or the raising of the body to life by a reunion with the soul, in the Scriptures, the presumption is very strong that they are so used in this.

The event described in Rev. xx. 4, will occur at the time fixed upon, in other parts of the Bible, for the resurrection of the righteous dead.

It is not meant that the sacred writers fix the time of the resurrection at any particular period or century, but that they foretell those events which will be contemporaneous, and with which the resurrection of the righteous will have an important relation.

The resurrection is made to synchronize with the personal appearing of Christ, and with the destruction of the anti-christian power. In confirmation of this statement we will refer to a few passages of Scripture: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first."—1 Thess. iv. 16. In this passage the resurrection of the righteous, or "the dead in Christ," is represented as being at the time when Christ shall appear. The same events are undoubtedly referred to in the following passages, though in different language: "When

he shall come to be glorified in his saints."—2 Thess. ii. 10. "Afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming."—1 Cor. xv. 23. "And the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee."—Zech. xiv. 5. These texts will suffice to show that the Scriptures teach that the righteous dead will be raised by Christ when he shall come.

At the same time, or nearly at the same time, Christ will destroy the antichristian power. The two events, the destruction of the antichristian power and the resurrection of the righteous, are associated with his coming. In some passages the destruction of the wicked is mentioned in connexion with his coming—and in others the resurrection, and in still another class, the three events are named or implied. We will now refer to some passages which teach that Christ will destroy the wicked at his coming.

"Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him," Rev. i. 7. "And then shall that wicked be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming," 2 Thess. ii. 8; see also, Rev. xix. 11–21.

In the following passages, the coming of Christ is associated with the destruction of the antichristian power and the resurrection of the righteous.

"Thy dead men shall live, *together with* my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead. Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast, for behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity. The earth also shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain."—Isa. xxvi. 19–21.

"And I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, and nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not

be destroyed."—Dan. vii. 13, 14. This appearing of the Son of man was at the destruction of the persecuting power, as will be seen by referring to the verses preceding. And although the resurrection of the saints is not here announced, it is implied, as will appear by referring to the interpretation contained in the 26th and 27th verses. "But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." Should it be objected that the saints spoken of here as those who reign with Christ, are holy men living in mortal bodies, and not those who shall come with him when he shall appear in his kingdom, we would answer that nowhere in the Bible are we taught that men, in a mortal body, reign with Christ. While they are mortal, they suffer with Christ, but they are glorified and reign with him in immortal bodies. But a discussion of this topic is reserved to another place. At the closing up of the perilous times which will continue during the reign of the persecuting power, there will be a resurrection of the righteous. "And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."—Dan. xii. 1, 2.

The following translation of the 2d verse has been given. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, those (who awake) shall be to life; those (who do not awake) shall be to shame and everlasting contempt." It is contended that this rendering conforms better to the Hebrew idiom than that found in the English Bible. In the twelfth chapter of Daniel, a statement of time is given for the closing of the wonders which the prophet saw in vision. For our present purpose, it makes no difference whether the number of days given are to be understood as literal days, denoting the closing scene of the reign of antichrist; or symboli-

cally, as representing the whole of his reign. The fact to which attention is called, is that when the days shall close, the Son of man will appear, destroy the persecuting power, and raise the righteous dead; for Daniel had the assurance that he should stand in his lot at the end of the days.

We are aware that it will be contended by some that in these passages taken from the Old Testament, a figurative or spiritual coming of Christ, and not a literal or personal, is foretold, and also that the resurrection is figurative and not literal. It is, we suppose, well known that the Jews, in the time of Christ, derived from these and kindred passages, the belief that the Messiah would come, put an end to the reign of wickedness, and raise the righteous dead. It is known, also, that the disciples of our Lord had similar views. It is certainly true that the Jews mixed up much error with the leading facts which they believed were taught respecting the renovation of the earth, the destruction of the persecuting power, the appearing of the Messiah, and the resurrection of the saints to reign with him. Were their views respecting the leading facts which they supposed their Scriptures taught, a corrupt interpretation of a worldly mind? Our Saviour nowhere condemns them. He did condemn those opinions which an unholy ambition had associated with the reign of the Messiah. But he carefully discriminates between the chaff and the wheat, between error and fact. When his disciples manifested solicitude about who should be the greatest, or who should have the first places in his kingdom, he rebuked their ambition, but did not in the least intimate that they would not "reign with him on the earth." And when, after his resurrection, they asked him, "wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" he rebuked their anxiety about knowing the times, but left them to cherish their previous opinion respecting the events which they earnestly desired should take place speedily. And when they stood gazing up into heaven, whither their Lord had gone in a cloud, the two men who stood by them in white apparel gave them words of consolation, which were calculated to strengthen their belief that he would yet set up his kingdom on earth according to what they supposed had been taught by the prophets. The apostles of our Lord nowhere condemn their former belief on this subject. On the contrary,

their language was such as to make the Jews, at least, think that they still believed as they had done. What if they did teach that Christ must have suffered according to the Scriptures? They did not thence deny their former belief, respecting his reign. They taught two comings instead of one, and thus solved the mystery which was in the minds of the prophets, when they searched "what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow."—1 Pet. i. 11. They taught that there was one coming to suffer, and another to reign. And when they spoke to the Jews about this distinction, how it was necessary for him to suffer and to be received up into heaven for a time, and of the fact that he would come again according to what was spoken by all the prophets, they used language which was calculated to confirm their general views on that subject. Take the following passage, "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: whom the heaven must receive, until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began."—Acts iii. 20, 21. And what did the hearers of Peter believe about the restitution, at the appearing of the Messiah, spoken of by all the prophets? We know how they interpreted the prophets; and here we would appeal to every candid person, to say, if after hearing Peter's discourse, the Jews would not necessarily think that he still believed in a literal restitution, at the appearing of the Messiah, at some future period? As words and phrases are conventional, and have the meaning given to them by those who use them, what else could Christ and his apostles have meant when they employed the language which was in common use to designate the renovation of the earth, the coming of the Lord, and the resurrection of the saints, if they did not mean to teach that these events would literally occur in accordance with the views generally derived from the prophetic Scriptures? Let us ask again, how do we determine the meaning of a writer, if not by interpreting his words and phrases, by applying the meaning usually attached to them by his contemporaries? How can we understand him better than by as far as possible putting ourselves in the position of those whom he de-

signed to teach, whose errors and prejudices he wished to overcome, and whose minds he wished to enlighten so that they might have a clear perception of the truth?

It appears from the prophecy of Daniel, that at the termination of a definite period, the Son of man will come in the clouds of heaven. Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth will awake, and Daniel himself, after resting in his grave, will stand in his lot, and the persecuting power will be destroyed, and the saints possess the kingdom to reign with the Son of man. As we have before suggested, and shall hereafter substantiate, this reigning is in a glorified state, and not in a state of suffering, of mortality. By referring to Revelation xx. 4, it will appear that what is there predicted, will occur at the same definite period of time, when Christ shall go forth to destroy the antichrist, or the persecuting power. And what else can it be but the resurrection of the saints to reign with Christ?

In a former article, we showed that Mr. Barnes considered the man of sin described in 2 Thess. ii. to be identical with the beast and false prophet of Rev. xix., and that Christ will destroy this power at his second coming. Now it is a conceded point, that the righteous dead will be raised, when Christ shall come the second time. Since, therefore, the righteous will be raised at the time when antichrist will be destroyed, at the very time designated in Rev. xx. 4; and since the language in that passage appropriately describes such a resurrection, why should we suppose that, not this, but some other fact is revealed?

It is evident that this passage contains an account of the resurrection of the saints, from the fact that those who are spoken of will reign with Christ. The privilege of reigning with Christ appertains to the saints, in a glorified and risen state. The condition of the privilege of reigning with him, is suffering with him, remaining steadfast during the time of sojourn in a mortal body, subject to conflicts with the world and Satan. Consequently, the reigning is beyond this life. And the sacred Scriptures place it in the resurrection state, when the saints will be raised in a body like unto that glorious body of Christ with which he will appear, and in which he will reign. Thus the Scriptures teach. "And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, that ye which have fol-

lowed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."—Matt. xix. 28. "I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."—2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. "And if children, then heirs: heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ: if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together."—Rom. viii. 17. Though there is not a direct statement that the crowning of the saints or their glory with him will be at the resurrection, it is nevertheless necessarily implied. It will be at "that day," by which we are to understand the day when Christ will appear and raise the dead. And by referring to the context, the reader will readily perceive that the glory of the saints spoken of in Romans viii. 17, will be when their "mortal bodies will be quickened," at "the redemption of their bodies." "It is a faithful saying, That if we be dead with him, we shall also live with him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with him; if we deny him, he also will deny us."—2 Tim. ii. 11, 12. Thus it appears that reigning with Christ, is after men have suffered with him in the flesh, and have risen with him. And, indeed, the reigning and triumphing of the saints will not be until the last enemy is destroyed, which is death. See 1 Cor. xv. 54–58. Since, therefore, the children of God reign with Christ only in glorified and immortal bodies, it is certain that the prophet speaks of the resurrection of the saints, in the passage under consideration.

As a further argument in proof of this position, we refer to the fact that in the early age of the church it was universally believed that the resurrection of the righteous dead was plainly taught by the writer in this place. Those who believed in the doctrine had no doubt of it; and when in after times some were disposed to call in question the doctrine of the millennium, the book of Revelation was rejected because that doctrine was found in it. When Justin Martyr wrote, there seems to have been a universal agreement of sentiment respecting what was taught by the Revelator when he said, "And they lived and reigned with

Christ a thousand years." Thus he says, "I and all who are right-thinking Christians, understand that there is to be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in Jerusalem, built, beautified, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the others proclaim. For Isaiah says of this thousand years, 'There shall be a new heaven and a new earth, and they shall not remember the former, nor shall they come into their heart; but they shall find joy and exultation in that which I create; for behold, I make Jerusalem an exultation, and my people a rejoicing.'. Moreover, a certain man among us, named John, one of Christ's apostles, in a revelation made to him, foretold that those who believe in our Christ are to pass a thousand years in Jerusalem, and that after that, the resurrection general, and (of all without exception) ever enduring, and the judgment, are to take place."—Dial, c. 80, 81. He thus represents it as the faith of all intelligent and orthodox Christians, that there are to be two resurrections, one of believers in Christ anterior to the thousand years *spoken of in the passage* under discussion, and one after that period. This agreement of the orthodox of that age is decisive. The church was then in its best days, and many still survived who had been contemporary with John, and had received the Revelation from him.

We now propose to show that Rev. xx. 4–6 will not admit of any other construction than that which derives from it a literal resurrection of the righteous dead.

The passage must be construed grammatically, or be regarded as an allegory. If it is an allegory, the language must be construed according to usage, in order that we may have a definite idea of the symbol. There is nothing in the language to indicate that it is an allegory. There is no intimation in the whole chapter that it is to be so interpreted. When the obvious construction is given, a sense is derived which accords with a fundamental doctrine of the Scriptures, to wit: that the righteous dead will be raised up, and will reign with Christ; that they will be raised when he shall appear the second time, and shall put an end to the reign of the persecuting power. We shall perhaps again hear the objection, that we do not find here a literal resurrection, because John said, "I saw the souls (not the bodies), and they lived." But we have already shown, we think, that

this is a mere assertion, without any foundation, and that Mr. Barnes has himself made this obvious; and besides, those who were seen to live were a part of the ζαρν, consequently the living again of the dead [ζαρν], necessarily involves the idea of a resurrection of the body. Since, therefore, there is no reason for adopting an allegorical construction derived from the language used, or from the analogy of faith, we shall, if we are governed by just laws of interpretation, admit that a literal resurrection of the dead is here taught.

The martyrs raised up to reign with Christ would not be an apposite symbol to represent those who will live on earth in mortal bodies, and subject to the infirmities and trials incident to such a state of being. Those who adopt what is called a spiritual interpretation, think that they find an analogy in this passage to the fact that John the Baptist was called Elijah. But the analogy will not hold good, for as Elijah lived in a mortal body, and was subject to trial and persecution, was a prophet, and a bold man, John the Baptist was like him in all of these particulars, and in no way inferior to him. But those whom John saw did not live in mortal bodies. He did not see the souls of the martyrs living in their bodies, as they were before their death; but he saw them living and reigning with Christ. Hence, if the meaning of the passage is, that men will live on earth during the thousand years, similar to those whom John saw in vision, as John the Baptist was similar to Elijah, then the earth will be inhabited at that time by men like the martyrs, or saints, glorified with Christ in his kingdom. It should be borne in mind, that John did not see the martyrs living in mortal bodies, for then they had conflicts, endured hardships, were persecuted, were slain, and did not reign. There is no intimation in the passage of a reviving of the spirit of the martyrs in the church, nor of a reviving of the martyrs in their former state, nor of the existing of men similar to what the martyrs were while they were sinners, or sanctified only in part, and subject to trial and death. The language describes saints living in a glorified state, even reigning with Christ. Either the resurrection of the saints to glory is designated, or persons living on earth in mortal bodies similar to the saints in glory. But it would be a con-

tradiction to affirm that men will live in mortal bodies during the millennium, like unto the saints reigning with Christ, as John the Baptist was like unto Elijah. To exist in a state of trial, and in a state of triumph, are not alike, but unlike, and opposite. To be sinful, and made perfect in holiness, are not like or similar, but dissimilar and contrary. To be in mortal bodies, and subject to death, and to be immortal and to reign in triumph over death, are not similar, but opposed to each other. Hence, beings who were once mortal and sinful, subject to persecution, and had died, but who now live again immortal, holy, triumphing, reigning with Christ even, are not appropriate symbols of imperfect and mortal men.

Furthermore, the opinion that men will live on the earth during the millennium, and will reign with Christ, while they live in mortal bodies, is contrary to the Scriptures. The martyrs did not reign with him. They suffered with him while they were on the earth. Suffering with Christ comes before reigning with him. It is sufficient that the servant be as his master. If Christ was persecuted, so are his disciples subject to trials. When John and James asked of our Saviour the privilege of sitting, the one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom, he gave them to understand that before they should enjoy triumphing with him, they must drink of his cup. And in truth, the Scriptures everywhere teach that the children of God are in a state of humiliation and conflict, while in a mortal body, and their triumphing and reigning is reserved until death is swallowed up in victory. Hence, the laws of language, and the doctrines of revelation, forbid that we give this passage such an interpretation, as would make it teach that men will live on earth, possessing the spirit of the martyrs, or similar to what they were before death, or that men will live on earth in mortal bodies, like the saints in a glorified state.

Ch. liii. 1. Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?

2. For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him, there is no beauty, that we should desire him.

3. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

4. Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

5. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.

6. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.

7. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth.

8. He was taken from prison and from judgment: and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was he stricken.

9. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth.

10. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.

11. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.

12. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he hath poured out his soul unto death; and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

LOWTH'S TRANSLATION.

Ch. lii. 13. Behold, my servant shall prosper; he shall be raised aloft, and magnified, and very highly exalted.

14. As many were astonished at him; (to such a degree was his

countenance disfigured, more than that of man; and his form, more than the sons of men;)

15. So shall he sprinkle many nations; before him shall kings shut their mouths; for what was not before declared to them, they shall see; and what they had not heard, they shall attentively consider.

Ch. liii. 1. Who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of Jehovah been manifested?

2. For he groweth up in their sight like a tender sucker; and like a root from a thirsty soil: he hath no form, nor any beauty that we should regard him; nor is his countenance such, that we should desire him.

3. Despised, nor accounted in the number of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; as one that hideth his face from us; he was despised, and we esteemed him not.

4. Surely our infirmities he hath borne; and our sorrows he hath carried them: yet we thought him judicially stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

5. But he was wounded for our transgressions, was smitten for our iniquities; the chastisement by which our peace is effected, was laid upon him; and by his bruises we are healed.

6. We all of us like sheep have strayed; we have turned aside every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath made to light upon him the iniquity of us all.

7. It was exacted, and he was made answerable; and he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb; so he opened not his mouth.

8. By an oppressive judgment he was taken off; and his manner of life who would declare? for he was cut off from the land of the living; for the transgression of my people he was smitten to death.

9. And his grave was appointed with the wicked; but with the rich man was his tomb. Although he had done no wrong, neither was there any guile in his mouth;

10. Yet it pleased Jehovah to crush him with affliction. If his soul shall make a propitiatory sacrifice, he shall see a seed, which shall prolong their days, and the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand.

11. Of the travail of his soul he shall see the fruit, and be satisfied; By the knowledge of him shall my servant justify many; for the punishment of their iniquities he shall bear.

12. Therefore will I distribute to him the many for his portion; and the mighty people shall he share for his spoil: because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the trans-

gressors; and he bare the sin of many; and made intercession for the transgressors.

HENGSTENBERG'S TRANSLATION.

Ch. lii. 13. Behold, my servant shall reign well; he shall be high and extolled, and very exalted.

14. Like as many were shocked at my servant,—(his countenance was so disfigured, that it was no more a human countenance; his form, that it was no longer a human form;)

15. So will he sprinkle many Gentile nations, kings will shut their mouths before him; for what has not been announced to them they see, and what they have not heard they perceive.

Ch. liii. 1. Who believes our report, and the arm of Jehovah, to whom is it revealed?

2. He grew up before him as a shoot, as a root-sprout out of a dry ground; he had no form nor beauty, that we should look upon him, nor comely appearance, that we should desire him.

3. He was despised, and the most abject of all men, a man of sorrows, and familiar with disease; he was as one before whom a man covers the face; we despised him, and esteemed him not.

4. But he bare our sickness, and took our pains upon himself, and we esteemed him as one afflicted of God, smitten and tormented of God.

5. And he was pierced for our misdeeds and bruised for our sins; the punishment was laid on him, that we might have peace, and by his wounds we are healed.

6. We all were going astray like sheep, we turned every one to our own way; but Jehovah cast upon him the sin of us all.

7. He was abused, but he suffered patiently, and opened not his mouth; as a lamb which is brought to the slaughter, and as a sheep which becomes dumb before its shearers, he opened not his mouth;

8. By oppression and a judicial sentence he was dragged to punishment; (but who can declare his posterity?) he was taken away out of the land of the living for the sin of my people, upon whom the punishment should have fallen.

9. They appointed him his grave with the wicked; (but he was with the rich man after his death,) although he had done nothing unrighteous, and there was no guile in his mouth.

10. But it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he has subjected him to disease. When he has brought a sin-offering, he shall behold a posterity, he shall prolong his days, and the purpose of Jehovah shall prosper through him.

11. Because of the labor of his soul he beholds, satisfies himself; by his knowledge shall he, the righteous one, my servant, justify many, and bear their sins.

12. Therefore will I give him the mighty for a portion, and he shall divide the strong as a spoil, for a reward; because he has given up his life to death, and suffered himself to be numbered with the transgressors. And he will take the sins of many upon himself, and make intercession for the transgressors.

ALEXANDER'S TRANSLATION.

Ch. lii. 13. Behold, my servant shall do wisely, shall rise and be exalted and high exceedingly.

14. As many were shocked at thee—so marred from man his look, and his form from the sons of man—

15. So shall he sprinkle many nations; concerning him shall kings stop their mouth, because what was not recounted to them they have seen, and what they had not heard, they have perceived.

Ch. liii. 1. Who hath believed our report? and the arm of Jehovah, to whom has it been revealed?

2. And he came up like the tender plant before him, and like the root from a dry ground; he had no form nor comeliness, and we shall see him, and no sight that we should desire it.

3. Despised and forsaken of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with sickness, and like one hiding the face from us, despised, and we esteemed him not.

4. Surely our sicknesses he bore, and our griefs he carried; and we thought him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.

5. And he was pierced for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and by his stripes we were healed.

6. All we like sheep had gone astray, each to his own way we had turned, and Jehovah laid on him the iniquity of us all.

7. He was oppressed, and he humbled himself, and he will not open his mouth—as a lamb to the slaughter is brought, and as a sheep before its shearers is dumb—and he will not open his mouth.

8. From distress and from judgment he was taken; and in his generation who will think that he was cut off from the land of the living for the transgression of my people, a curse for them?

9. And he gave with wicked men his grave, and with a rich man in his death; because (or although) he had done no violence, and no deceit was in his mouth.

10. And Jehovah was pleased to crush him, he put him to grief;

if his soul shall make an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah in his hand shall prosper.

11. From the labor of his soul he shall see, he shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my servant, as a righteous one, give righteousness to many, and their iniquities he will bear.

12. Therefore will I divide to him among the many, and with the strong shall he divide the spoil, in lieu of this that he bared unto death his soul, and with the transgressors was numbered, and he bare the sin of many, and for the transgressors he shall make intercession.

We have before said that this prophecy contains a complete exhibition of the doctrine of atonement. We now proceed to justify that observation, by a doctrinal analysis of its contents. In our citations from the prophecy, we shall feel at liberty to make use of either of the versions before us —that of King James's translators, that of Bishop Lowth, that of Prof. Hengstenberg, or that of Prof. Alexander. All that the prophet has here taught, is susceptible of an easy and natural arrangement, under the four general heads of the necessity, the nature, the extent, and the results of the atonement.

I.—The Necessity of the Atonement.

God has informed us, in his word, that he "will by no means clear the guilty," nor "at all acquit the wicked." The necessity for an atonement, in order to the forgiveness of sin, results, therefore, from the relation of the divine government to human guilt. It is of the same nature and force as the necessity for inflicting punishment on the guilty violators of God's righteous law. In order to the vindication of the divine veracity and justice, guilt must either be punished in the transgressor, or expiated in a substitute. "Without shedding of blood is no remission." Hence the necessity of an atonement is taught in all the places in this prophecy, which speak of our transgressions, iniquities, and sins. More particularly, it is taught in verses 6, 8, and 10. When, in verse 6, the prophet declares, that we were all going astray like sheep, and that Jehovah has laid upon his servant the punishment of our iniquities, what

is this but a declaration that, if our sins had not been punished in a substitute, they must have been punished in ourselves? When, in verse 8, he represents the substitute as smitten for our transgressions, what inference is possible but that our transgressions could not be otherwise forgiven? When, in verse 10, he affirms, that, as the result of the Redeemer's making his soul an offering for sin, he shall see a seed, and the gracious purpose of Jehovah respecting the redemption of his people, shall take effect, what else does he say, how otherwise are we to understand him than that, without such a sacrifice, the justification of sinners is impossible?

II.—The Nature of the Atonement.

The fundamental fact of the atonement is stated almost in every verse of this prophecy. Its nature is portrayed in the following particulars:

1. The principle of atonement is substitution—the substitution of an innocent person to suffer the punishment due to the guilty. Substitution is, again and again, announced in the prophecy, as the principle of atonement. For example, in verse 4, "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows." In verse 5. "He was wounded for our transgressions," &c. In verse 6, "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." In verse 8, "For the transgression of my people was he stricken." And in verse 12, "He bare the sin of many." If we proposed, in this article, as, however, we do not, to treat fully of the fact and nature of this substitution, the inquiry would take a twofold direction, viz. first, into the exact verbal import of the several modes of expression employed by the prophet in announcing the doctrine; and, secondly, into the import of the legal sacrifices, to which there is a plain allusion in the tenth verse, and which were but faint and partial representations of the one great and effective offering for sin accomplished by the Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross—a sacrifice containing within itself the full significance and completion of the whole sacrificial system.

2. The humanity of the substitute. This is involved in all those expressions, scattered throughout the prophecy,

which relate to his growth, sufferings, and death. But it is more distinctly taught in verse 3, where he is expressly declared to be "a MAN of sorrows."

3. The divinity of the substitute. Several Hebrew manuscripts, according to Hengstenberg, have a reading in the fourth verse, the translation of which would be, "a smitten God." This reading has been adopted by some biblical critics, as Bellarmine, Sanctius, Galatinus, and others. If it could be shown to be the true reading, it would afford a direct and explicit testimony to the divinity of the Messiah. But it is probably a gloss. Nor is it necessary to retain it, in order to find in the prophecy a testimony to the divine dignity of the person who forms the subject of it. His divinity is implied in all the places, which declare the efficacy of his atoning work. It is implied, also, in those splendid expressions, by which the exaltation and glorification of the servant of Jehovah are described, in the closing verses of both chapters—expressions too energetic and glowing to be employed in reference to any mere creature.

4. The designation and appointment of the substitute by the Father. This we have in verses 6 and 10, "Jehovah hath laid upon him the iniquity of us all." "It pleased Jehovah to bruise him." "The purpose of Jehovah shall prosper through him."

5. The voluntariness of the substitute. This is implied throughout the whole prophecy. It is plainly intimated in verse 7, where it is said, "He opened not his mouth." And it is distinctly affirmed, according to Hengstenberg's translation, in verse 12, where it is said, "He gave up his life to death, and suffered himself to be numbered with the transgressors; and he will take the sins of many upon himself."

6. The righteousness of the substitute. The subject of the prophecy was not only a man, but a sinless man. This is affirmed in v. 5, where the cause of his suffering is declared to be "our transgressions;" in v. 8, where he is said to have been "taken off by an oppressive judgment," *i. e.* an unrighteous judicial decree; in v. 9, where it is said, that "he did no wrong, neither was any guile in his mouth;" and in v. 11, where he is called "the righteous servant of Jehovah."

7. The sufferings of the substitute. There is no occasion

for special citations here, since these sufferings constitute the burden of the entire prophecy.

8. The meekness and patience of the substitute. These qualities are elegantly and touchingly set forth in the seventh verse: "It was exacted, and he was made answerable, and he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth."

9. The world's estimate of the character and sufferings of the substitute. This we have at large in vs. 2–4; but it is summed up in those expressive words, "despised and rejected of men."

III.—The Extent of the Atonement.

1. In its nature the atonement is general; sufficient for the needs of the whole race of sinners. "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," v. 6.

2. In its application, the atonement is limited by the electing love of God. "The PURPOSE of Jehovah shall prosper through him," v. 10. "For the transgression of MY PEOPLE, was he stricken," v. 8. "Therefore will I distribute THE MANY to him for his portion; and the MIGHTY PEOPLE shall he share for his spoil," v. 12. The plain meaning of these Scriptures is: First, that Messiah, the righteous servant of Jehovah, came into the world in execution of a divine purpose: secondly, that that purpose had respect to the purchase and salvation of a definite, though numerous and mighty people, given to him for his portion: and, thirdly, that the purpose should prosper through him, *i. e.* should receive its full accomplishment. Hence it appears, that, while the atonement is general in its nature, of infinite value, and in possible efficacy, co-extensive with the effects of the fall, so that it affords ground for an unfeigned call to repentance and life, to be extended to all mankind; still the redemption purchased by it is particular, limited, by the sovereign purpose of Jehovah, to that elect people, which were given and secured to the Messiah, as the reward of his humiliation, in the covenant under which he suffered. Hence, also, it appears, that the motive which prompted the Son of God to assume our nature, and lay down his life upon the cross, was

not mere general benevolence, but love for his own people. And hence, finally, it appears, that the limitation of the atonement is a limitation, not in respect to its nature or worth, but in respect to the purpose of God, and intention of Christ.

IV.—The Results of the Atonement.

These are:—

1. The resurrection of Christ. This is pre-supposed and implied in all those parts of the prophecy, which describe the victories to be achieved by the Messiah subsequently to his death, and, indeed, as the fruit and reward of his death. It is also expressly predicted in v. 10, where, immediately after the annunciation of his death, it is added, "He shall prolong his days."

2. The exaltation of Christ. This is declared in ch. lii. 13, 15, "Behold, my servant shall reign well; he shall be high, and extolled, and very exalted; . . . kings will shut their mouths before him." Also in ch. liii. 10, 12, "He shall behold a posterity, he shall prolong his days, and the purpose of Jehovah shall prosper through him." "Therefore will I give him the mighty for a portion, and he shall divide the strong as a spoil."

3. The intercession of Christ. This is affirmed in v. 12, "He will take the sins of many upon himself and make intercession for the transgressors." In these words, there is also an intimation as to the manner of his intercession. Not by mere prayer does the servant of God intercede with him for sinners, but also by presenting before him his vicarious sufferings and merits, as the ground of obtaining for them forgiveness and salvation. The sense is happily expressed by Calvin thus: "That which was shadowed forth under the old law, where the priest never appeared before God without blood to intercede for the people, has been fulfilled in Christ. For, in the first place, he offered the sacrifice of his body, and poured out his blood, that he might suffer the penalty due to us; and then, that the expiation might become effective, he performed the office of an advocate, and interceded for all who should by faith embrace this sacrifice."

4. The certain redemption of the elect. This is taught in v. 10: "The purpose of Jehovah shall prosper through him."

5. The justification of believers. Of this we have assurance in v. 11: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities."

6. Peace with God. This result is declared in v. 5: "The chastisement by which our peace is effected, was laid upon him."

7. Sanctification. This is affirmed in lii. 15, and in liii. 5: "So shall he sprinkle many nations:" "With his stripes we are healed."

8. The universal triumph of the gospel, and the final salvation of the larger portion of the human race. Of this, the prophet gives us assurance in lii. 13, 15; and in liii. 10–12; to which passages the reader is referred.

9. The abundant joy and satisfaction of the Redeemer, in these fruits of his work. This is set forth in v. 11: "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied."

Thus copiously does this most evangelical prophet declare the necessity, nature, extent, and glorious efficacy of Messiah's mediatorial and atoning work. The sum is: That the righteous servant of Jehovah, even his incarnate Son, having no sin himself, submits to be numbered with the transgressors, and to be treated as the vilest of them all. Voluntarily assuming our sins, and carrying them as a heavy burden laid upon him, he suffers, on our account, and in our room and stead. He consents to be made answerable as our surety, and the debt is exacted of him. He offers up his precious life as a propitiatory sacrifice, like to those under the law, to procure for us a release from the punishment due to our offences, himself graciously suffering the penalty, that he may free us from its woes. Thus is he wounded for our transgressions, and smitten for our iniquities; and this in such a manner, that our peace is effected by his chastisement, and we are cleansed by his blood, and healed by his stripes. But, although he submits to be smitten to death, he cannot be holden of the grave. As his humiliation is the greatest possible, as he is abhorred by all those who see him in that condition, being despised and rejected of men; so are his exaltation and glorification equally remarkable.

People and kings submit to him with the deepest reverence, and worship him with adoring awe. He reigns prudently and prosperously, multiplying victories on every side. Yea, the many are distributed to him for his portion, and he shares the mighty for his spoil.

In the light of these inspired teachings, we see the error of those spiritual guides, who would have us believe that "Christ was a person sent into the world to promulgate the will of God; to communicate new lights on the subject of religious duties; by his life to set an example of perfect obedience; by his death to manifest his sincerity; and by his resurrection to convince us of the great truth which he had been commissioned to teach, our rising again to a future life; and hence, that the sum of Christianity is, to furnish a purer morality, and a more operative enforcement; its morality more pure, as built on juster notions of the divine nature; its enforcement more operative, as founded on the certainty of a state of retribution."

Very different from all this is the inspired representation of the person, mission, and offices of Jesus Christ, which it has been the purpose of these pages to unfold. Here he is distinctly set before us as the substitute of transgressors; as bearing the punishment of their sins; as making expiation for their guilt by the sacrifice of himself; as becoming, in their stead, the *anathema*, the devoted thing. This is the sum of revealed religion,—Christ's atonement, satisfaction, sacrifice, redemption. It is the corner-stone of the fabric. It is like the name of Phidias in the shield, which could not be destroyed, without destroying the shield. It is the central truth of the gospel; nay, it is itself the gospel. And a gospel for sinners, without the doctrine of atonement and expiation, would be like the planetary system without the sun,—dark, cold, cheerless, dead. It is not a mere teacher, however wise, nor a mere example, however perfect, that can meet the conscious want of rational beings, at enmity with their Maker. Mere instruction can never take away guilt; nor procure pardon, nor free the soul from remorse, nor remove the apprehension of divine wrath, nor impart spiritual life to the dead in sin. In him who undertakes the work of our salvation, we must see one qualified to stand up between the throne of infinite justice and us guilty

rebels; one able to answer the overwhelming claims of the divine law against us; one who can lay his hand on both parties,—on God as the Son of God, and on man as the Son of man,—and mediate peace between them. The Lord Jesus Christ is such a Redeemer. On the cross on Calvary, we see in him our *atoning* high priest, with a spotless humanity, and a true divinity, the offering and the altar of God's own appointment. On the mediatorial throne in heaven, we see in him our *interceding* high priest, who has with his own blood entered into the holiest of all, there to appear before God as our advocate. He is our Saviour, and he alone, of all the beings in the universe. None on earth, and none in heaven, shall divide the crown with him.

Art. IV.—Christ's Second Coming.

BY THE EDITOR.

A GREAT change has taken place within a few years in the views entertained by Protestants in this country and abroad, respecting the destiny of the despotic and persecuting powers of Western Europe, that are represented by the wild beasts, Dan. vii. 7, 8, and Apocalypse xiii. Until within a recent period, the notion generally prevailed that they were gradually to be purified from their antichristian elements, and converted into generous patrons and fosterers of the church, and that under their genial protection and favor, the nations were to be recovered from barbarism and false religion, raised from ignorance and debasement, and ushered into the culture, sanctitude, and bliss of the millennium. The announcement made to the Israelitish people that the great judgments with which they were to be smitten through a long tract of ages, were at length to terminate in their restoration to their own land, re-establishment as God's chosen people, and enjoyment of all the blessings of peace and security, and that the Gentile nations, in place of conquerors and oppressors, should become their friends; that kings should be their nursing fathers, and queens their nursing

mothers; was, under the allegoric theory of interpretation, almost universally held to relate exclusively to the Gentile church, and treated as a prediction that the very monarchs represented by the ten-horned beast, and others of like character out of the limits of the western Roman empire, are to become the great defenders and patrons of the church, and that it is under their cherishing care that the gospel is to be communicated to the nations, and the world brought under its purifying and gladdening influence. Multitudes held that this happy transformation is to be wrought by the infusion into the governments of a larger measure of the representative element, the gift of full civil and religious liberty, and the diffusion of useful and refining knowledge, by which it was thought the masses would be gradually freed from their coarseness and selfishness, imbued with taste, and moulded into a pure and lofty character. The sheer and disheartening disappointment of these brilliant hopes within the last few years, by the violation by most of the monarchs on the continent, of their pledges of a constitutional and more liberal government, their endeavors to wrest from their subjects the faint relics of civil and religious freedom which they still enjoy, the sudden recovery of the Catholic hierarchies from seeming decrepitude to unusual vigor and activity, and what is equally startling and portentous, the proofs the people have everywhere given of their utter inadequacy to self-government, from their false notions of liberty, their fierce and malignant passions, their deadly hatred of religion, and their disposition to follow the guidance of dreamy and reckless leaders,—this unexpected and astonishing turn of events, and the indications that now everywhere fill the political atmosphere, of still worse tyrannies from the rulers, and more violent outbreaks from the people, have produced a general conviction that the insupportable evils with which those nations are now struggling, are advancing not to a peaceful issue, but to some terrible catastrophe, in which the present political organizations are to end, and that if better structures are to succeed, they are to to be built on different foundations, and of other materials.

What, however, is to follow the earthquake by which the present political despotisms are to be engulphed, few even among those who are aware that the Scriptures foreshow their

destruction, seem to have any well founded or clear idea. Many who admit that they are to perish, as is signified in the sacred word, by the direct interposition of the Almighty, still cherish the notion that a better class of mere political governments is to be erected on their ruins, and adhere to the belief that it is after all, under their fostering care, and by the use of the mere means that are now employed for the purpose, that the nations are to be raised from their debasement, and brought to accept and obey the gospel. Under the guidance of false principles of interpretation and the prepossessions they have generated, they fail to see that the very Scriptures from which they learn that the antichristian powers are to perish by the immediate hand of God, teach also with equal explicitness that Christ, with his risen saints, is to be the agent of their destruction; and that the epoch of his interposition for that purpose, is the epoch of his second coming, resurrection of his saints, and commencement of his New Jerusalem reign, which they assign to a far later period; and the epoch also of his restoration of the Israelites and conversion of the nations, which they suppose are to take place, if they take place at all, a long time anterior to his coming. We propose to show that the Scriptures exhibit these events as intimately connected with each other, and as to take place immediately before or at the commencement of the thousand years of Christ's reign on the earth.

I. We shall first adduce predictions that show that the coming of Christ in the clouds and institution of his millennial kingdom, is to take place at the time of the destruction of the antichristian rulers symbolized by the ten-horned wild beast and the false prophet. Of these, one of the most explicit is Daniel's vision of the rise and destruction of the fourth beast, and Christ's coming in the clouds and investiture with the dominion of the earth, Dan. vii. 7–27, which we transcribe from Wintle's translation:

"I was seeing after this in the visions of the night, and behold a fourth beast formidable and terrible, and strong exceedingly, which had large teeth of iron; it devoured and broke in pieces, and trampled upon the remains with its feet, and it was distinguished from all the beasts that were before it, for it had ten horns. As I was attentive to the horns, behold another little horn grew up among them, and three of the former horns were torn out before it, and behold

eyes like human eyes were in that horn and a mouth speaking presumptuous things. I was seeing, till the thrones were placed, and the Ancient of days sitting. His raiment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool, his throne was flames of fire, his wheels the ardent fire. A fiery stream trailed and issued from before him; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand ten thousands assisted before him; the council sate, and the books were opened. I was attentive at this time on account of the voice of the presumptuous words which the horn spoke. I was attentive till the beast was slain, and its body destroyed, and it was delivered up to the burning of fire. Also of the rest of the beasts their dominion was made to pass away, but [though] a continuance in life was given them until a limited period or a time.

"I continued seeing in the visions of the night, when behold in the clouds of heaven was coming one like the Son of man, who advanced even to the Ancient of days. And when they had brought him near before him, He gave him dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom such as shall not perish.

"As to me, Daniel, my spirit was pierced with horror in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head disturbed me. I advanced towards one of those that assisted, and inquired of him an exact account concerning the whole of this; which he related to me, and made me acquainted with the interpretation of the matters. These large beasts which are four, are four kings that shall arise in the earth. Yet the saints of the Most High shall assume the kingdom, and shall possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever. Then I desired an accurate information concerning the fourth beast, which was distinguished from all of them, exceedingly formidable, whose teeth were of iron, and his claws of brass, that devoured, broke in pieces, and trampled upon the remains with his feet. Also concerning the ten horns which were on his head, and of the other which grew up when three fell before it, even that horn which had eyes, and a mouth speaking presumptuous things, and whose aspect was more stout than his fellows. I was seeing when this horn made war with the Saints, and prevailed over them; until the Ancient of days came, and gave judgment to the Saints of the Most High, when the appointed time arrived that the Saints should possess the kingdom.

"Thus he replied: The fourth beast shall be a fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be different from all the kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and thresh it down, and break it in pieces. Also the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall

arise; and another shall arise after them, which shall be distinguished from the former, and shall reduce three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the Saints of the Most High, and shall presume to alter appointed seasons and the law, which shall be given into his hand until a time and times, and the division of a time. But the judgment shall sit, when his dominion shall be taken away, to be wasted and destroyed unto the end. Yet the kingdom and the dominion, and the wide extent of empire under the whole heaven, shall be given to a people, the Saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all the potentates shall be subject and obedient to it."

This translation agrees in all essential particulars with the common version. Its most important difference is that it indicates more clearly that the vision in which one like the Son of man was seen coming in the clouds of heaven, was a continuance of that in which the fourth beast was beheld; in the same manner as the vision of the latter was a continuation of that in which the preceding beasts were seen. It was by a continued looking that the several agents, actions, and events of the whole series were beheld; and it is a clear and indubitable revelation that the coming of Christ in the clouds of heaven, is to take place at the time of the judgment and destruction of the civil and ecclesiastical powers symbolized by this fourth beast.

In the first place, the one like the Son of man who came in the clouds of heaven, and was invested by the Ancient of days with the dominion of the earth, is Christ the Son of man himself; and his coming in the clouds in the vision symbolizes his real advent in the clouds when he comes to judge and destroy his enemies, raise the saints from the grave, and establish on earth his everlasting kingdom. That the one like the Son of man is the Messiah, is admitted by both Jewish and Gentile commentators generally, and is proved by Christ's appropriating the title to himself, and avowing to the high priest (Matth. xxvi. 6) that it is he who shall at a future time be seen coming in the clouds of heaven. But it is equally certain that he appeared in the vision as the representative of himself. This is seen from the consideration that it is a law of symbolization that the divine personages who appear in the visions, appear as their own representatives; and because no created agents are ade-

quate to represent them in the situations in which they appear as the Creator, the lawgiver, and the Redeemer of men, and exert their infinite attributes and peculiar prerogatives as such. Whenever the Father and the Son appear, it is as their own representatives; and whenever they are represented as to appear at a future period, it is by their acting as symbols of themselves in the visions in which that representation is made. It is seen also from Christ's annunciation to the high priest, in the passage to which we have already referred, that he is at a future time to be beheld coming in the clouds of heaven; from his prediction that all the tribes of the earth shall see him coming in the clouds with power and great glory (Matth. xxiv. 30); and from the announcement by John, that he is to come in that manner, and that every eye shall see him.—Rev. i. 7. It is clear, also, from the consideration that there is no other person who is ever to be exalted to that supreme jurisdiction over the earth with which he is to be invested. It is he alone who is to hold the sceptre of the whole earth, and be the King of kings, and Lord of lords. These lofty titles belong exclusively to him. It is of him alone that it is predicted that all his enemies shall be made his footstool; and that all dominions and all nations shall serve him; and it is his kingdom alone that is to continue for ever and ever. —Dan. vii. 14–27; Rev. xi. 15. No point then can be clearer than that he who appeared in the clouds in the vision, and was invested with the supreme dominion of the earth, was the Almighty Redeemer, and that he appeared as his own symbol. That is not only the just construction of the vision, and the only one which the laws of symbolization authorize; but it is the only construction that does not contradict the vision and the whole strain of prophecy in regard to his second coming, and the sovereignty that he is for ever thereafter to exercise over the earth. Who was it that appeared coming in the clouds, if it was not the eternal Word? Who was it that he symbolized in receiving the sceptre of the earth, to be held for ever and ever, if it was not himself, the incarnate Redeemer? And who is to be invested with a kingdom and glory and dominion, that all peoples and nations and languages should serve him through an eternal reign, if it is not he, the incarnate Word, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, whom

all potentates are to obey, and whose dominion is never to pass away? Is there any other than the Messiah who is to be invested with that supreme power by the Ancient of days? Is there any other than he who is to wield it through eternal ages? Is there to be an equal, or a crowd of equals, who are for ever to divide the sovereignty of the earth with him, and exercise a like universal and absolute sway? What grosser contradiction to his attributes and the teaching of his Word can be conceived? No one will contend for so unscriptural and revolting a notion.

In like manner his coming in the clouds in the vision, symbolizes his real personal coming in the clouds at the period to which the vision of his coming refers. This results of necessity from the principle on which divine symbols are used. As the one like the Son of man in the vision, is the symbol of the Son of man himself in the acts which the vision foreshows; so his act in coming in the clouds in the vision must symbolize his real personal coming in the clouds at the epoch to which the prediction relates. It cannot be supposed to have any other representative office, without supposing that instead of being his own symbol, he acts as the symbol of some other agent or agents. The act foreshown by the coming in the vision, must necessarily be the act of the person who is represented by the Son of man who came in the vision. That act is also a real personal coming in the clouds. There is no other that it can represent. A real coming cannot represent a real not-coming. They are not the same or similar, but direct opposites; the one an act, the other a contra non-act. A real visible coming cannot represent a mere invisible act that does not involve a personal coming. They, in place of the same or similar acts, are also direct opposites. Nor is there any other act which his advent in the vision can represent, but his real personal advent in the clouds at the epoch to which the prediction refers.

And, finally, for the same reason, the investiture in the vision of the one like the Son of man with the sovereignty of the earth, symbolizes the real investiture of the Son of man at his personal coming in the clouds, with the dominion of the world, and the institution of his kingdom here. The act foreshown by this part of the vision, is a real investiture,

precisely as the act foreshown by his coming in the clouds in the vision, is a real personal coming in the clouds.

We have thus, in this great prophetic spectacle, a clear and indubitable revelation that the Son of God is to come in person in the clouds of heaven, and be invested by the Ancient of days with the sceptre of our world at the period which the vision contemplates. No revelation through symbols can be more specific and indisputable. By the laws of that instrument of prediction the spectacle does not admit of any other construction; and no other can be assigned to it without involving it in the most revolting confusion and inconsistency, and contravening the whole current of prophecy in respect to the great personage who is hereafter to come in the clouds, and the station he is to fill as the supreme sovereign of the earth.

In the next place, it is equally clear that the time of this coming and investiture is that of the destruction of the powers represented by the ten-horned beast. This is apparent from the whole current of the vision. The kingdom over which Christ is to reign, is that kingdom which is to succeed to that of the fourth beast. No fifth empire is to intervene between them. The vision of Christ's coming and enthronement immediately followed the vision of the fourth beast's judgment and destruction, just as the vision of the rise of the fourth beast to supreme power immediately followed that of the overthrow of the third beast that preceded it. And as the second beast conquered the first and succeeded in its place to the general sovereignty, and as the third beast conquered the second and rose to supreme power in its place, so also Christ is himself to destroy the powers denoted by the fourth beast, and immediately establish his universal kingdom on the ruins of theirs. There is no other period to which his coming can, without the most arbitrary contradiction to the prophecy, be referred. Some have maintained that the coming which the vision foreshows, was Christ's first coming, and that the investiture it symbolizes, took place at his ascension. But he did not then *come* to our world in the clouds of heaven, and his ascension was a *departure* in the clouds *to* heaven, instead of a coming from it. To hold that he came in the clouds of heaven at his first advent, is to imply that he came with his body from that world, and

thence that he was already incarnate, antecedent to his conception and birth. But that his advent and investiture are to take place at the same epoch as the destruction of the powers symbolized by the fourth beast, is placed beyond all doubt by the vision itself. His advent and reception of the dominion of the earth, took place at the same session of the Ancient of days, as the judgment and destruction of the fourth beast. There not only is no intimation that the Ancient of days withdrew after the judgment of the beast, and that it was at an appearance and session at a different period, that the Son of man came to him, and was installed as the monarch of the earth; but such a supposition is precluded by the express announcement that the fourth beast was to continue, and its eleventh horn make war on the saints, and prevail over them, "until the Ancient of days came, and gave judgment to the saints of the Most High, *when the appointed time arrived that the saints should possess the kingdom*," v. 22. Here the time when the kingdom is to be established in which the saints are to reign under Christ as their supreme king, is expressly defined to be that at which the Ancient of days is to come to the judgment and destruction of the fourth beast; and this is confirmed, as we shall hereafter see, by other passages in which it is taught that it is by Christ himself and his saints, that the beast is to be destroyed. The great certainty is thus revealed in the most specific manner in this vision, that Christ's public visible coming in the clouds of heaven, is to take place at the epoch of the destruction of the antichristian powers symbolized by the ten-horned beast, and that he is then to be invested with the sovereignty of the earth, and establish his kingdom here, that all people and nations may serve him.

That his second coming is to take place at the destruction of the antichristian hosts, is revealed with equal explicitness also, Rev. xix. 11–21.

"And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he who sat on it, called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he judges and makes war; and his eyes, as a flame of fire; and on his head many diadems, having a name written which no one but he knew. And he was clothed in a garment dyed with blood, and his name is called the Word of God. And the armies which in heaven

followed him on white horses, were clothed in fine linen, white and pure: And from his mouth proceeds a sharp sword, that with it he may smite the nations; and he shall rule them with an iron sceptre, and he shall tread the wine-press of the wine of the vehemence of the wrath of God Almighty. And he has on his garments and on his thigh a name written King of kings, and Lord of lords.

"And I saw an angel stationed on the sun. And he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the birds that fly in midheaven, Come, gather ye together to the great supper of God, that ye may eat flesh of kings, and flesh of commanders of thousands, and flesh of mighty men, and flesh of horses and of them that sat on them, and flesh of all both freemen and slaves, both small and great.

"And I saw the wild beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war with him who sat on the horse and with his army. And the wild beast was taken, and the false prophet with it, who wrought wonders before it with which he deceived those who received the mark of the wild beast, and those who worshipped its image. And they two were cast alive into the lake of fire which burns with brimstone. And the rest were slain with the sword which proceeded from the mouth of him who sat on the horse: and all the birds were filled with their flesh."

Here the person who sat on the white horse with eyes like flames of fire, and many diadems on his head, was the Word of God, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; and he came to judge and destroy the powers represented by the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies. And—as in the preceding vision, and for the same reasons—he represents himself; his coming from heaven followed by his redeemed hosts, symbolizes his real coming in the clouds at the epoch which the vision contemplates; and his destruction of the wild beast, false prophet, and their party, an actual destruction which he is then to inflict on them. This is the construction which the laws of symbolization require, and the only one which the symbols admit. Who does the Word of God represent, if it be not himself? Is there any created being of whom he can be supposed to be the symbol? Is there any creature, of such attributes, station, and prerogatives, that the Almighty Word, in his peculiar nature and office as the Incarnate Jehovah, the Saviour and Judge of men, can appropriately act as his representative? Is any mere creature to come in that manner from the opened

heavens, followed by the armies of redeemed saints, and as the King of kings and Lord of lords, judge and destroy the great apostate powers who are to be assembled in war on Christ? Can any one fail to see that the supposition is inconsistent with, and derogatory to, Christ's perfections; as it implies that that creature is to assume or be invested with his office, and act as though he were in reality the eternal Word —the identical crime for which those represented by the wild beast and false prophet are to be arraigned and destroyed? And how, moreover, is such a supposition to be reconciled with the unsymbolic predictions which explicitly announce that it is by Christ himself in person and visibly descending from heaven, that the antichristian party is to be destroyed at the great epoch to which the prophecy refers? Are those hosts to be twice taken and cast alive into the lake of fire; once by the eternal Word; once by a mere creature invested with his insignia, and bearing his incommunicable name? No one will venture to affirm it. Yet such are the implications in which they involve themselves, who attempt to make out that the Word of God does not in this vision represent himself. As then he thus symbolized himself in the vision, the acts he exerted are of course representative of his own acts. His visibly coming from heaven in the vision, as the eternal Word, the Judge and Avenger, accordingly, symbolizes his real visible coming from heaven; and his destruction of the wild beast and false prophet, his really destroying the apostate powers, denoted by these symbols. To suppose them the acts of another agent, would be to suppose that the being *symbolized* by him is also a different agent. The advent from heaven, the judging, making war, and destroying, must of necessity be the acts of the agent who is symbolized as coming and exerting those official and avenging actions. How can it any more be denied that his advent in the vision denotes his personal advent at the fulfilment of the prophecy, than it can that his judging, warring, and destroying in the vision, symbolize his real acts of judgment and destruction when the prophecy is accomplished? To set aside any one of the representative acts as of no significance, is in effect to set aside every other, and treat the whole as an unprophetical pageant.

His coming, therefore, which is foreshown, is a real and

visible coming. And as his advent and agency in the vision were visible and personal, so the coming and agency which they represent must be real and visible. Why should it be imagined that his presence is not to be personal and visible, any more than that his acts of judging and destroying the beast are not? How can it any more be assumed that *he* is to be wholly invisible, than that the wild beast, the false prophet, the kings, and their armies are? Those who maintain that *he* is only to be invisibly present, must, to be consistent, hold that the antagonist powers also are only to be invisibly there, and convert the whole into a mere conceptional pageant, without reality or significance. For why should those who are symbolized by the wild beast, false prophet, and their hosts, be supposed to be assembled for a battle, if there is to be no visible opponent whom they can assail? Or if men only are to be their opponents, and the agents by whom they are to be destroyed, why were not they exhibited in the vision as the party with whom the apostate powers are to make war, and by whom they are to be destroyed? The consistency of the different parts of the vision, and the laws of symbolization, require that the great Judge should be personally and visibly present, as much as that the apostate powers should be who are to be judged and destroyed.

And finally, the destruction of the powers symbolized by the wild beast and false prophet, the kings and their armies, is to be a real and visible destruction. There is nothing else which the death inflicted on their representatives in the vision, can symbolize. Mr. Barnes, indeed, with a singular disregard of analogy, alleges, that the slaughter of the armies, by "the sword of him who sat upon the horse," "perhaps indicates that the effect that is to be produced when these great powers shall be destroyed, is a *moral* effect; that is, that they will be subdued by the word of the Son of God." But what can a *moral* slaughter be, unless it be a spiritual death? And does Mr. Barnes imagine that those vassals and allies of the beast and false prophet are, anterior to the battle, to be in spiritual life, that is, genuine disciples of Christ, and that they are, in punishment of their subservience to the beast on that occasion, to be plunged, and by the word of the Redeemer, into a new apostasy? Does he hold that sin

can be directly inflicted, like a violent death, by the sword of the Almighty Word, and as a penalty of sin? A beautiful specimen of the unwarrantable conjectures to which he and others resort to mould the prophecy to their preconceived theories, and get rid of the unwelcome revelation which it presents, that Christ is to come in person at this great crisis, and conquer his marshalled foes by his *own* almighty hand. Mr. Barnes, however, admits that the destruction of the wild beast and false prophet is to be a real corporeal destruction. Of their dejection alive into a lake of fire and brimstone, he says, "The overthrow will be as signal, and the destruction as complete, as if the leaders of the combined hosts should be taken alive, and thrown into a pit, or lake, that burns with an intense heat." On what principle, then, can he presume that the slaughter of their armies by the sword of the Word of God, does not symbolize a real corporeal death? Is not the destruction of life by a sword, as real a destruction, as a destruction of it by fire? And if so, is not the one as much entitled to be considered as symbolizing a real infliction of corporeal death, as the other?

That the destruction is to be real, is admitted also by commentators generally. Hengstenberg says of the vision: "Everything here bears the impress of anger; all points to blood and death;" "The eyes of Christ as a flame of fire; the sword which goes out of his mouth; his iron rod, his garments stained with blood, the wine-press of his wrath, which he treads—all plainly indicate that the mission of Christ here is one more immediately of wrath and judgment." The reality and visibility of their destruction is admitted and maintained, also, by Mr. Faber. "The parties," he says, "destroyed in the battle, are the various powers, civil and ecclesiastical, of the apostate Roman empire; the time of their destruction is the close of the latter 1260 years; the region where their destruction takes place, is the land of Palestine." But to admit that the antichristian powers are thus to be personally and visibly present, and suffer a real and visible destruction, is in effect to admit that the great Avenger by whom they are to be destroyed, is also to be personally and visibly present. The principles of symbolization indicate that Christ and his hosts are to be personally and visibly present, as clearly as that the parties

symbolized by the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies are. The great law that agents in the visions, denote agents in the scenes which the visions represent; and that visible agents and acts symbolize visible agents and actions, holds as absolutely of Christ and his armies, as it does of the antichristian hosts. To deny it and claim that the two classes of symbols are to be construed in such opposite modes, is not to interpret, but arbitrarily to pervert the prophecy to support a preconceived and anti-scriptural theory. If their mode of treating the vision were correct, it would be impossible for Christ, on the supposition that he is to be visibly present at the battle of Armageddon, to make a revelation of it by any species of symbols. For what others could be so adapted to represent it, as the vision he has chosen for the purpose, in which he himself appeared as his own symbol, bearing the titles and insignia of his office, as the avenging Judge, the King of kings, and Lord of lords, and attended by his redeemed hosts, and seizing the wild beast and false prophet, cast them into a lake of fire, and slew the kings and their armies with the sword of his mouth? Can any other spectacle be conceived that would show so resistlessly that he is the Being who is to be present at that crisis, and exercise the acts of judgment and vengeance that are thus ascribed to him? Can any greater contradiction to his offices and prerogatives be imagined, than that his place should, on that occasion, either be left wholly vacant, or be filled by mere creatures? Are there any acts, that belong more exclusively to him, or that indicate more clearly that they are to be visibly exerted, than those that were exerted by him in the vision? The dejection of the wild beast and false prophet *alive* into the lake of fire and brimstone, denotes that those whom they symbolize, are then to be subjected to the second death; and implies, therefore, first, that they are to be publicly judged and condemned to that punishment. That judgment, accordingly, is expressly foreshown in the parallel vision, Dan. vii. 9–11. Thus the Ancient of days came, the counsel sat, the books were opened, and after the trial, the beast was slain, and its body destroyed by "the burning fire." But next, that judgment implies that the Judge himself is to be personally present, and his acts of judgment and vengeance visible and public. There is no intimation in the

Scriptures that any individual is to receive his final award, except after a public trial, according to the deeds done in the body. The righteous, whether living in the natural body, or raised from death, are to be publicly judged at the time of their acceptance; and the wicked, whether in the natural life, or raised from the grave, are to be publicly judged at the time of their sentence to the second death.—Matth. xxv. 31–46; Rev. xx. 4–15. The infliction of the second death on the parties—embracing a great number of persons—denoted by the wild beast and false prophet, as well as every other part of the vision, shows in the most emphatic manner that the Almighty Judge is to be personally and visibly there, invested with the insignia of his office, as the incarnate Word, attended by his countless hosts, and is publicly to try, sentence, and consign the usurping and blaspheming powers arrayed against him, to the second death.

But that he is then to come in person and visibly, is placed beyond all doubt, by the express announcement in the unsymbolic prophecies that he is, at that epoch, to be *revealed* from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ," and that the wicked one, the man of sin, he shall then "consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming."—2 Thess. i. 7; ii. 8. To deny that he is to come in person and openly, at that epoch, is therefore not only to contravene the symbolic representations that are made of it, but to offer a direct contradiction to the express teachings of the prophets on the subject in their unsymbolic predictions. We have thus in this great vision, as well as in that before considered, a clear revelation that Christ's coming in person and glory to our world to judge his enemies, is to take place at the epoch of the destruction of the antichristian powers symbolized by the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies.

It is indicated also very clearly by the symbols under the sixth seal. After the prophet had witnessed a great earthquake, the darkening of the sun and moon, the fall of stars from heaven, and the departure of the heavens as a scroll, he adds: "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman, hid them-

selves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb, for the great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand."—Rev. vi. 15–17. Here the antichristian leaders, instead of being symbolized by the beast and false prophet, as in the vision (Rev. xix. 11–27), appear, like their armies, in their own persons as kings and great men; and they, of course, represent the real persons who are to be arrayed against Christ at the crisis to which the vision relates. There are no others whom they can represent. That the epoch is that of Christ's second coming, is shown by the cry to the mountains and rocks to hide them from the wrath of the Lamb; for the great day of his wrath is come. The acts of the kings and their hosts in fleeing to the dens and rocks for shelter, and cry to them to fall on them, symbolize their own acts, and are the identical acts they are to exert on that occasion. There are no others that they can represent. As they act as their own symbols, their actions of necessity represent the acts they are themselves then to exert. There are no analogous acts that they can be supposed to represent. That their terror is to be occasioned by him that sits on the throne, and that they are to desire to hide themselves from his face and from the wrath of the Lamb, even by being buried beneath the mountains, bespeaks in the most emphatic manner that he is to be visibly present and enthroned as Judge and Avenger. Why should they cry out in agony to be hidden from the face of him who sitteth on the throne, if no Almighty avenger seated on a throne is visible? Why should they fly in such terror from the wrath of the Lamb, if the Lamb is not visibly present for the purpose of inflicting on them his wrath? Why should they imagine the great day of his vengeance is come, if no visible signals of it are seen? That he is to be visibly present, is thus as clearly and impressively shown, as symbols and language can indicate it; while the supposition that he is not to be present, contradicts every feature of the vision, and converts it into an extravagant and senseless solecism.

The coincidence of his coming and judgment of the hostile nations is revealed also under the seventh trumpet:

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven saying: The sovereignty of the world has become our Lord's and his Messiah's, and he shall reign for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders which sat before God on their seats, fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power and hast reigned. And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, to judge and give the reward to thy servants the prophets, and the holy, and those who fear thy name, small and great, and to destroy those who destroy the earth."—Rev. xi. 15–19.

Here the time of Christ's reception of the sovereignty of the world and the commencement of his eternal reign over it, and the time at which he is to execute his wrath upon the angry nations, and judge the dead and give reward to his servants the prophets, and the holy of all ranks and ages, is expressly shown to be the time of the seventh trumpet, which, it is acknowledged by all parties, is to precede the millennium, and is to be the time of the destruction of the antichristian powers symbolized by the wild beast and false prophet. It is equally acknowledged also, that at the time of the judgment of the dead and the reward of his servants, he is to be personally and visibly present.

And finally the same coincidence of Christ's coming and the destruction of the antichristian powers, is revealed in Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the image. The prophet said: "Thou wast seeing until a stone was torn out without hands, and struck the image upon his feet of iron and clay, and broke them in pieces. Then were broken in pieces as at the same time, the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, and were like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, and the wind carried them away, so that no place was found for them; but the stone which struck the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." And the explanation given of this is, that "in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven raise up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, neither shall the kingdom devolve to another people. It shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, but itself shall stand for ever; inasmuch as thou sawest that from the mountain was torn out a stone

without hands, and it broke in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold;—the great God hath made known to the king what is to be hereafter."—Dan. ii. 34–45. Here, as the image symbolizes the supreme rulers of the four empires, and the feet and toes especially the kings of the western Roman empire that are to be in authority at the time of the destruction of the image, so the stone torn out without hands by which the image was broken, symbolizes the kings who are to reign in the fifth kingdom, and extend their empire over the whole earth; for it is the kingdom,—that is, the company of kings of the kingdom,—which God is to raise up, that is to break in pieces and consume all the preceding kingdoms, and is itself to stand for ever. But those kings are to be the risen and glorified saints of the Most High. This is known from the express revelation in the Apocalypse (chap. xx. 4–6), that they are to reign as kings with Christ during the thousand years. It is known also that they are not the unglorified saints from the revelation (Dan. vii. 14, 15–27) that all peoples, nations, and languages then subsisting, are to be the subjects of their joint empire with Christ. As all in the natural life are to be subjects of the saints who are to exercise kingly authority over them, those who exercise that authority must be risen and glorified saints. But they are not to be raised from death, and enter on their kingly reign, till Christ comes in the clouds and assumes the empire of the earth. It is when he shall come at the judgment and destruction of the powers denoted by the wild beast, be invested with the dominion of all people, nations, and languages, and commence his eternal reign over them, that the saints are also to be invested with their crowns and sceptres, and enter on their reign with him. (Dan. vii. 9–27.) The time of his second coming, therefore, and the destruction of the antichristian powers, is the same.

We have thus, in five different symbolic visions, a clear revelation that Christ's coming and establishment of his millennial kingdom on earth, is to be at the time of the judgment and destruction of the apostate powers symbolized by the wild beast. In the first in the order of time—Dan. ii. 34–45—it is shown that the destruction of the powers denoted by the feet of the image—the rulers of the western Roman empire in its

last form—is to be the work of the kings of the new kingdom of God that is to succeed theirs; that those kings are to be the saints of the Most High, and that they are to enter on their reign immediately on their having destroyed the antichristian powers, of which the toes of the image are the symbols. But the time of their entering on their reign, we know, is the time of Christ's personal coming. Next in the vision, Dan. vii., it is expressly revealed that the Son of man is to come in the clouds of heaven, and be invested with the everlasting dominion of the earth at the time of the ten-horned beast's destruction, and that the saints of the Most High, who are of a different order from the peoples and nations living on the earth, are also at that epoch to receive kingly authority, and begin to reign with him over the world. In the third vision, Rev. vi. 12–17, the antichristian powers previously symbolized by the image and the wild beast, appear in their own persons as kings and their armies, and show by their flight to the dens of the mountains, to hide themselves from the face of him that sits on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb, and their cry of terror and despair, that the great day of his wrath is come, that he is then to be visibly present and consign them to their doom. His coming and their destruction are therefore to be at the same epoch. In the fourth, Rev. xi. 15–18, it is announced that at the sound of the seventh trumpet, the sovereignty of the world is to become Christ's, and that that is the time when he is to inflict vengeance on the hostile nations, and when the holy dead are to be judged and rewarded; which is the time of their resurrection, investiture with crowns, and entrance on their millennial reign. But the period of the seventh trumpet is the period of the destruction of the antichristian host. Christ's coming, destruction of his enemies, and assumption of the dominion of the earth, are therefore to take place at the time of the seventh trumpet, and thence are to precede the millennium. And, finally, in the fifth vision, Rev. xix. 11–27, he descended in person from heaven, followed by the redeemed and glorified saints, and destroyed the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies; thus showing, in the most specific and impressive manner, that his second coming, and the judgment and destruction of those antichristian hosts are to take place at the same time. The coincidence of

these great events revealed in such a series of visions, and presented in such a variety of connexions, is thus invested with the most indubitable certainty. Scarce an event foreshown in the whole circle of the prophecies, is more clearly defined, or demonstrated by more ample evidence. To doubt that they are to occur at the same epoch, is to discredit the truth of these predictions. They admit of no other construction by the laws of symbolization, and if they are to be taken as revealing the divine purpose, they make it certain that Christ's coming in the clouds, and the overthrow of the anti-christian hosts, are to take place at the same period.

But that this construction of these symbolic visions is correct, is confirmed and placed beyond doubt by several unsymbolic prophecies, in which it is foreshown with equal explicitness that Christ is to come in person and visibly reveal himself at the destruction of the apostate hosts that make war upon him. Thus Zech. xiv.

"Behold the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee. For I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city. *Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations*, as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the Mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south. And ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains; for the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azal; yea, ye shall flee like as ye fled from before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah; *and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee.* And it shall come to pass in that day, that there shall not be light nor darkness; but it shall be one day that shall be known to the Lord, not day nor night; but it shall come to pass, that at evening time it shall be light. And it shall be in that day, living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the former sea, and half of them toward the hinder sea; in summer and in winter shall it be. *And the Lord shall be king over all the earth:* in that day shall there be one Jehovah, and his name one. All the land shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem, and it shall be lifted up and inhabit-

ed in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king's wine-presses. And men shall dwell in it; and there shall be no more utter destruction; but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited."

This prophecy, which is expressed wholly through language instead of symbols, and is to be interpreted by the laws of philology, thus foreshows in the most express manner that Jehovah is to come visibly at the last great battle of the apostate nations against him, and that that interposition to destroy them and redeem his people, is to be followed by his reign on the earth and the conversion of the nations, and is therefore to precede the millennium. Thus, 1. The time of his coming is to be "the day of the Lord," when all nations are to be gathered "against Jerusalem to battle," which in the Apocalypse is called "the battle of the great day of God Almighty," for which the kings of the earth are to assemble at Armageddon, near Mount Tabor in Palestine, the place where, and the occasion when, the antichristian hosts are to be destroyed. 2. Jehovah is to be visibly present. He is to go forth and fight against those nations, as he fought in the day of battle, against the Egyptians at the Red Sea, where he was visibly present in the pillar of cloud and fire, and "looked unto the host of the Egyptians, through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians, and took off their chariot wheels, so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from the face of Israel, for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians." "*His feet* also shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem," which shows that his form is to be human, and that he is to be the incarnate Word. And, finally, with him all the saints are to come, who being raised from death in glory, are also to be visible. This corresponds with the representation in the vision, Rev. xix. 14, in which the armies of heaven, clothed in white robes, the symbol of justification, followed him in his descent from heaven to the contest with the wild beast and his armies. 3. The antichristian hosts are to be struck with consternation by the visible presence of Jehovah, and thrown into tumult. "A great tumult from the Lord shall be among them, and they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbour, and his hand shall rise up

against the hand of his neighbour," v. 13. This accords with the representation (Rev. vi. 15,16), in which the kings and their armies are exhibited as crying in terror, "the great day of his wrath is come," and endeavoring to hide themselves from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb. 4. The hostile hosts are to be destroyed by the immediate hand of God in an extraordinary manner, and probably in a measure by fire. "And this shall be the plague with which the Lord will smite all the people that have proceeded to fight against Jerusalem. Their flesh shall consume away while they stand upon their feet, and their eyes shall consume away in their sockets, and their tongue shall consume away in their mouth," v. 12. This accords with the vision (Dan. vii. 11) in which the wild beast was "given to the burning flame," and Rev. xix. 20, in which "the wild beast and false prophet were taken and cast alive into the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone; and the kings and their armies were slain with the sword that proceeded out of the mouth of him that sat on the horse." 5. Their destruction is to be immediately followed by the reign of Christ on the earth as the King of kings and Lord of lords. "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth. In that day, there shall be one Jehovah, and his name one," v. 7. This is in harmony with the vision (Dan. vii. 14), in which the Son of man came "in the clouds of heaven, and was invested with a kingdom, and glory, and dominion, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him," and Rev. xix. 11–16, in which he came from heaven bearing the title King of kings and Lord of lords, and held an iron sceptre with which to rule the nations; and Rev. xi. 15, in which, at the sound of the seventh trumpet, it is announced that "the sovereignty of the world has become Christ's, and he shall reign for ever and ever." 6. And, finally, it is to be immediately followed by the peaceful residence of the Israelites in their ancient capital, and the conversion of the Gentile nations; which shows that it is to precede the millennium. "All the land shall be turned as a plain from Geba to Rimmon south of Jerusalem, and it shall be lifted up and inhabited in her place. . . . And men shall dwell in it, and there shall be no more utter destruction, but Jerusalem shall be safely inhabited. . . . And it shall come to pass that every one that is left

of all the nations which came up against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles. . . . In that day shall there be upon the bells of the horses, *holiness to the Lord;* and the pots in the Lord's house shall be like the bowls before the altar; yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness unto the Lord of hosts," v. 10–21.

This language thus reveals with the utmost certainty the same great truths respecting the second coming of Christ:—that it is to take place at the time of the last great battle with the antichristian hosts; that it is to be personal and visible; that he is to be attended with his saints; that his presence is to strike his enemies with the utmost terror; that he is to destroy them in an extraordinary and awful manner; that he is immediately to commence his reign over all the earth; and that all the surviving nations are at once to become obedient to his sway:—the identical events that are revealed in the symbolic visions we have considered, as to attend and follow his coming in the clouds, and they are as indisputably foreshown in this prophecy, as they are in those. No language could have been chosen in which they would have been more unequivocally foretold. There is no difference among commentators as to the grammatical sense of the passage: there is no pretence that the events we have enumerated are not the events that are signified by the language taken in its philological meaning: and that is as unquestionably its true and only sense. There is no method of forcing on it another meaning, except by an arbitrary allegorization or spiritualization wholly unauthorized by the Scriptures, and unknown to the principles of language, and the very object of which is to set aside the true sense of the sacred word, and substitute a fiction in its place.

The principal of those events are foretold also (Isaiah lxvi.) where it is announced that Jehovah will at length discriminate between his enemies and his children; and give a sudden and miraculous deliverance to the latter, v. 1–14; and that he will then "come with fire and with his chariots like a whirlwind to render his anger with fury, and his rebukes with flames of fire" (v. 15), which implies that he is to come visibly, as in Dan. vii. 9, when his throne was a fiery flame, and his chariot wheels burning fire; and a fiery

stream issued and came forth before him. The judgments he is to inflict are to extend to all nations. "For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with *all flesh*, and the slain of the Lord shall be many," v. 16. The parties who are to be destroyed, are especially idolaters and false worshippers, v. 17. Jehovah is then to reveal himself in his glory, to all nations; and all nations are to be converted. "And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall *all flesh* come to worship before me, saith the Lord," v. 23. And the time when this is to take place, is the time when the new heaven and new earth are to be created, v. 22; which shows that it is to be at the commencement of the millennium.

The coincidence of Jehovah's coming and reign, and the destruction of the hosts opposed to him, is foreshown also in Isaiah xxiv., xxv., xxvi., xxvii. After describing the desolation with which the earth is to be struck, and the terror that is to overwhelm its inhabitants when God visits it for its transgressions, the prophet announces that "it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth; and they shall be gathered as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in the prison; and after many days, shall they be visited. Then," it is added, "the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, for Jehovah of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously." The period to which this refers is undoubtedly, therefore, that of the judgments on the nations at Christ's second coming. No such events have hitherto taken place, nor is there to be any other period when "the earth is to reel to and fro, like a drunkard, be utterly broken down, and be devoured by the curse, and the inhabitants thereof burned that few men shall be left," v. 6, 19, 20. There is no other time when men are universally to be seized with consternation, and society dissolved, so that it shall be with the priest as with the people, with the master as with the servant, and with the seller as with the buyer, v. 2, and escape from destruction be impossible, because of a fiery
[illegible] from above, and earthquakes from beneath, v. 17, 18.
[illegible] the instruments, as we have already seen, with
[illegible] is then to affright and devour his enemies. The

host of the high ones who exalt themselves above God, and the kings of the earth are accordingly then to be punished, and shut up in the prison of hades through the long period that is to pass ere the last judgment comes, when they are to be arraigned and receive their final doom. That the time of their punishment and gathering to that prison, is to be the time of Christ's coming, is shown by the announcement that then Jehovah of hosts shall reign in Mount Zion in Jerusalem before his elders, and in such glory as to confound the sun and moon by the splendors of his presence (v. 23); which imports that he is to reign visibly, as is foreshown also, Rev. xxi., xxii. That that is to be its epoch, is made certain, moreover, by the announcement, that his people are then to be delivered, and are "to sing for the majesty of the Lord," which implies again that he is to manifest himself visibly; that the holy dead are then to be raised and receive their reward, chap. xxv. 8, xxvi. 19; and that the curse is then to be universally removed, and all nations brought to the knowledge and fear of God, xxv. 6–9. We have thus, in this prophecy, a clear revelation of the contemporaneousness with the destruction of the hostile kings of the earth and their hosts, of all the great events that are to attend the second coming of the Redeemer:—the infliction of terrible judgments on all the inhabitants of the earth, the assembling of the hostile armies with their leaders in array against God, their punishment and imprisonment in hades, the destruction of vast multitudes by fire, the deliverance of God's people, the resurrection of the holy dead, the reign of Jehovah in visible majesty, and, finally, the conversion of the nations and deliverance of the race from the curse thereafter, indicated by the wiping away of tears from all eyes: chap. xxv. 8.

A similar revelation is made, Dan. xi. 36–45; xii. 1, 2. "The king who is to do according to his will, and exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and speak marvellous things against the God of gods," v. 36, is the king that is denominated by John the eighth, and the beast from the abyss that is to go into perdition; for it is foretold expressly, that "he is to prosper till the indignation is accomplished;" that is, till the oppressions and persecutions of God's people are completed. Accordingly, at the time of the end, "the king of the south is to push at him, and the king

of the north come against him like a whirlwind; and he is to enter into the glorious land,"—or Palestine,—"and plant the tabernacle of his palaces between the seas and the glorious holy mountain, but he shall come to his end, and none shall help him," v. 40–45. The place of his destruction is thus the same as that assigned to the nations that are to be gathered against Jerusalem, Zech. xiv. 1, 2, and to the wild beast, false prophet, and their armies, that are to be assembled for the battle of the great day of God Almighty at Armageddon, Rev. xvi. 14–16, xix. 11–27. The time of his fall is accordingly to be the time of Christ's personal coming. For at that time Michael is to stand up, the great Prince that standeth for the people of God, and is to give deliverance to *every one who is found written in the book of life.* This implies that the righteous are then to be judged, as is foreshown, Rev. xi. 18, and thence that the first resurrection is then to take place. It is accordingly announced that the many who sleep in the dust of the earth are to awake: "these," the righteous, "to everlasting life" first as we learn from other prophecies, 1 Cor. xv. 23; at a later period, as shown 1 Cor. xv. 24, Rev. xx. 5, 11-15, "those," the unrighteous, "to everlasting shame and contempt." It is thus again foreshown, that the time of Christ's second coming is to be that of the destruction of the antichristian host.

And finally, the same revelation is made also in the New Testament, 2 Thess. i. 7–9, ii. 8, 9, where it is expressly announced that "that man of sin," "that wicked one," "whose coming is after the working of Satan," "the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy by the brightness of his coming;" and that that coming is to be personal and visible: for "the Lord Jesus shall be *revealed* from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints." The man of sin is the same power as is represented, Dan. vii. 8, by the little horn of the beast, and by the false prophet of John, Rev. xix. 20. The Son of God is to come personally and publicly to his destruction, as he is to theirs: and attended, in like manner, by his holy

ones; the destruction he is to inflict on the man of sin, is, like that of the beast of Dan. vii., and the beast and false prophet of the Apocalypse, xix., to be by fire; and he is then to give rest to his people, and reward them for their patience and fidelity in their tribulations, 2 Thess. i. 4–7.

We have thus, in each of these five passages, an explicit revelation that Christ's second coming in power and glory, is to take place at the destruction of the antichristian powers; and uniting these with the five symbolic prophecies in which their coincidence is also foreshown, we have, to say nothing of a great number of others to which we shall hereafter refer —ten distinct and independent prophecies of the contemporaneousness of those great events; and presented in such a variety of aspects and connexions as to give the revelation a definiteness and certainty that belong to scarce another prediction in the sacred word. This extraordinary array of announcements, expressed in so many passages in the most clear and unequivocal language, and in so many others through the most peculiar and unequivocal symbols, demonstrates the concurrence of those events beyond all justifiable doubt, and renders faith in it not only reasonable but obligatory. If the word of God uttered so frequently, and in such emphatic tones, is not entitled to be received, what can give credibility and authority to his testimony? To deny it, is, in effect, to deny that a revelation *can* be made that Christ's coming is to take place at the time of the overthrow of the antichristian powers; that there are either any words or any symbols through which such a prediction can be expressed. For through what symbols can their coincidence be signified, if not through those of Daniel and John? Or through what language can it be foreshown, if not through that of Isaiah, Daniel, Zechariah, and Paul? We may safely challenge those who deny it, to select a combination of words, or invent any representative signs, that can express it with greater certainty or explicitness. It cannot be struck from these passages by any legitimate process. These predictions are graven on the sacred page in ineffaceable characters. They are placed there as indestructible monuments of the divine purpose, and not to see them, is not to see the light of the sun at noonday; and to resolve not to hear them, is to resolve not to hear the

voice of the Almighty, though it is uttered in tones of thunder.

We shall now proceed to show that the resurrection of the holy dead is to take place at or near the time of the destruction of the antichristian hosts, and is to precede the millennium; and thence, that Christ's coming, at which the saints are to be raised, is also to precede that epoch.

That the holy dead are to be raised at Christ's second coming, is clearly revealed, and is universally admitted. "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own band; Christ the first fruits; then they that are Christ's at his coming; afterward the end," or last band, "when he is to deliver the kingdom to the Father; when he has put down all rule, and all authority and power."—1 Cor. xv. 22–24. But the resurrection of the saints is to take place at the epoch of the destruction of the antichristian hosts. This is taught in several of the passages which foreshow that Christ is to appear visibly at that time, and commence his reign on the earth.

Thus it is taught in the first prophecy, in which there is a specific prediction of the resurrection of the dead, Isaiah xxiv., xxv., xxvi., xxvii. After announcing that God will shake terribly the earth, and make it waste; that its inhabitants are to be burned, and few men left; that in that day God will punish the host of the high ones, and the kings of the earth upon the earth, and shut them up in the prison for a long period; and that then Jehovah shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, in glory before his elders, chap. xxiv.; it is added, chap. xxv. 8, that "He has swallowed up death in victory; and the Lord God wipes away tears from all faces; and the rebuke of his people he takes away from off all the earth." This prediction that he should swallow up death in victory, Paul explains of the resurrection of the holy dead, and change of the living saints; and declares that it is to be accomplished at Christ's coming. "Behold I show you a mystery. We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on

incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'"—1 Cor. xv. 51–54. The resurrection of the holy dead, and transformation of the living righteous, are thus expressly declared to be the event denoted by Isaiah's prediction that at the time when Jehovah "punishes the host of the high ones, and the kings of the earth," and "the branch of the terrible ones is brought low," should swallow up death in victory, and that is to be at Christ's coming, at the last trumpet. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first; afterwards, we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air."—1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. The resurrection of the holy dead, and Christ's coming in glory, are thus assigned to the same period as the destruction of the hostile kings and their armies, at the great battle of God Almighty.

Their contemporaneousness is indicated again in the prophecy in the song, chap. xxvi., that is to be sung in Judea "in that day," in which it is foreshown, on the one hand, that the enemies of God's people, whom he is to destroy, are not to rise then; and on the other, that the dead saints are then to live again. "Jehovah our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us; but henceforth thee, thy name only, will we celebrate. They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise," v. 13, 14. But the Israelites, instead of being annihilated, or wasted by such a destruction, are to be increased by the restoration of their pious dead to life. "Thou hast added to the nation, O Jehovah, thou hast added to the nation; thou hast glorified thyself. . . . Thy dead shall live, my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for the dew of herbs is thy dew, and on the earth thou wilt cause it to fall," v. 15, 19. And that this is to be at the time of the destruction of the antichristian host, is indicated by the exhortation to God's living people to hide themselves at that crisis, because he is to come forth to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity, and to destroy with his sword the serpent and the dragon, the

representatives of the two great apostate and hostile powers that war against his kingdom here. "Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee; hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity; and the earth shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain," v. 20, 21. "In that day Jehovah, with his sore and great and strong sword, shall punish leviathan, the swift serpent, even leviathan the crooked serpent, and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea."—Chap. xxvii. 1. As monsters bearing these names, the serpent and the dragon, are used in the Apocalypse as symbols of the two great enemies of God's kingdom, Satan and the usurping and persecuting civil powers, that are to hold their empire to the coming of Christ; they are the parties denoted by them here, and by the host of the high ones on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth, chap. xxiv. 21, 22, whom Jehovah is then to punish and shut up in prison for many days, while Jehovah reigns in Mount Zion in Jerusalem before his elders in glory.

We have thus, in this prophecy, a plain prediction that the resurrection of the holy dead is to take place at the time of the destruction of the great apostate powers that are arrayed against Christ, and that those powers are to be conquered and destroyed at his coming in glory, and commencement of his reign on Mount Zion. This is the plain sense of the passages, and the only construction which they admit. Nothing can be more certain than that no such events as they announce, have yet taken place; nothing can be more indisputable than that the great judgments and deliverances which they predict are precisely those which all the prophecies respecting the great day of God foreshow are to take place at the time of the destruction of the wild beast and false prophet, and the binding and imprisonment of Satan.—Rev. xix. 20, 21; xx. 1–3.

That the resurrection of the holy dead, and the coming of Christ, are to take place at the time of the destruction of the apostate hosts, is foreshown also in Dan. xi. 33–45; xii. 1–3. Thus, after predicting the termination of the Mosaic worship, the persecution of the holy down to the time of the

end, the rise at that epoch of the king who is to do according to his will and exalt himself above God, the war of that king,—who is the same as the eighth king of the Apocalypse, or last form of the beast that is to go to perdition,—and his fall in Palestine, betwixt the Mediterranean and Jerusalem, it is then announced, chap. xii. 1–3, that "at that time shall rise up Michael, the great Prince" Messiah, "that standeth up for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation to that time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book, and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise, shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars for ever and ever." The time of the interposition of Messiah, the great Prince, for the deliverance of his people, and the resurrection of the holy dead, is thus that of the fall of the usurping and lawless king, who is to be the last in the train of apostates, and is to perish at the time of the end. Then, also, they that are wise, and have turned many to righteousness, whatever the age may have been in which they flourished, raised from the grave, are to shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever. And the time when they are to be exalted to that glory, we are taught by Christ in the parable of the wheat and tares, is the end of the present age, or dispensation, when at Christ's coming the righteous and unrighteous are to be finally separated. "The harvest, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐστιν, is the end of the age. The reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered, and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this age. The Son of man shall send his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and those who do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire. Then the righteous shall shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."—Matth. xiii. 39–43. The period of the glorification of the redeemed, and thence of their resurrection, in which their glorification is involved, is thus the close of the present age, when Christ is to come, and cast his enemies into the lake of fire, deliver the living righteous, and raise his dead saints. It is there-

fore to be at the time of the destruction of the wild beast and false prophet, and is to precede the millennium; for they and their hosts are pre-eminently the parties denoted by the tares; as they are the antagonists of Christ and his people, who usurp his name and place, and the name and place of his people, and claim that, in contradistinction from him and his followers, they are the true kingdom of God.

That the coming of Christ and the resurrection of the holy dead are to contemporize with the destruction of the antichristian powers, is foreshown also 2 Thess. i. and ii. For the man of sin who exalts himself above all that is called God, and seating himself in the temple of God, claims that he is in fact God—represented in Daniel by the eleventh horn of the fourth beast, and in the Apocalypse by the two-horned wild beast and false prophet—is to be consumed by the spirit of Christ's mouth, and destroyed τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, by the revelation of his presence; that is, his appearance or manifestation of himself in person. That is the literal, the genuine, and the only sense of the expression. There is no room for a pretence that the terms are used metaphorically. They demonstrably are not. In the use of words by a metaphor, that which they affirm of the agent or object to which they are applied, is never literally true of it, nor can be, but only resembles what is true of it; as when a man is said to be a lion, to denote his boldness. The very office of the figure is to ascribe to agents or objects a nature, character, or act, that is in truth altogether foreign to it, but that still, by strongly resembling something that truly belongs to it, serves to illustrate its characteristic nature or agency. To suppose, therefore, that the visible personal manifestation of himself, which is here ascribed to Christ, is merely metaphorical, is to suppose that it is in fact impossible from his nature, that he should visibly reveal himself to men; which is not only to contradict the plainest teachings of the sacred word, and in effect to deny that he has a human body that is naturally visible to those who are in his presence; but is to set aside the numerous predictions which, all admit, expressly declare that he is to come in person, and in visible glory, at the resurrection of the holy dead, and the judgment of the living.

We have here, then, an explicit announcement that does

not admit of any other construction, that Christ is to be personally and visibly present at the destruction of the man of sin, and is to put an end to that impious usurper by the dazzling revelation of himself. When then is he thus to come in visible majesty and power? The answer is, as given by the apostle in the same epistle; when he comes to be glorified in his saints; and to be admired in all them that believe. "Seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense *tribulation* TO THEM *that trouble you;* and TO YOU *who are troubled, rest with us*"—at what epoch?—"when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; *when he shall come to be glorified in his saints*, and to be admired in all them that believe in that day."—Chap. i. 6–10. When then is he to come in that manner and for that purpose? The answer is, as given by the same apostle, when he comes to raise his dead saints in glory, and to transform the living. "For as we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also them that sleep in Jesus God will bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. *For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven* with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall first rise; afterwards we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord."—1 Thess. iv. 14–17. His coming in person and in visible majesty, which the apostle, in the passage before quoted, declares is to be at the destruction of the man of sin and his associate apostates, he here as explicitly represents, is to take place at the resurrection of the holy dead. His coming in glory therefore, the resurrection of the saints, and the destruction of the antichristian powers, are to be events of the same period, and the two first are as certainly as the last, to precede the reign of the thousand years.

These predictions are made through language, and are to

be interpreted by the laws of philology. But that Christ's coming and the resurrection of the holy dead are to take place at the same period as the destruction of the anti-christian hosts and anterior to the millennium, is revealed also in an equal number of symbolic visions.

Thus it is revealed (Rev. xx. 4–6) in one of the most resplendent and expressive visions of the Apocalypse, that the holy dead are to be raised antecedently to the thousand years, and are to reign with Christ during that period. That the symbols of that vision represent a real resurrection of the holy dead is indubitable, in the first place, from the consideration that there is nothing else that they can, without the grossest contradiction to their nature, be supposed to represent. The representative agents of the vision are the souls of the martyrs and other holy dead. On the supposition, then, that they were used as symbols of human beings that were not corporeally dead, and that their resurrection denoted an analogous moral change of those human beings, the laws of symbolization would require that those represented beings should be of the same *moral character* as the raised saints by whom they were symbolized. Otherwise, instead of an analogy, they would present a contrast to each other. It would be incongruous and contradictious to employ Satan as a representative of Gabriel, because it would imply that Satan resembled Gabriel in character, and that his agency also was like his in principle and spirit. When cruel and bloody conquerors are symbolized, wild and ferocious beasts, not gentle and harmless ones, are employed as their representatives. The holy cannot possibly, therefore, represent the unholy, nor the dead the living. It would be to use a symbol that bore to that which was symbolized, the greatest unlikeness, instead of a resemblance. The martyrs and other holy dead then, if they are used to represent human beings, must, of necessity, symbolize those who, like themselves, have been renewed and sanctified. But that makes it certain that their resurrection cannot symbolize *a moral change* of those whom they represent, from unregeneracy to regeneration; inasmuch as those whom they would symbolize, must have already been renewed. There is no change, therefore, of the soul, which their resurrection can denote, and consequently it must represent a

change of the body, and thence a corporeal resurrection from death to immortal life and glory, like itself; for there is no other change of the body bearing any resemblance to it in greatness and glory, which it can be employed to symbolize. From the very nature of the case, as the martyrs and other holy dead symbolize holy human beings who are dead, so their resurrection to a glorious corporeal and immortal life, must represent a similar resurrection of holy human beings from death to immortal life.

This is confirmed also by the consideration that if the resurrection of the holy dead were to be symbolized, there are no symbols but holy dead persons passing through that change, that could represent it. There is no other order of conscious agents in the world who exist in a condition like that of the souls of the holy dead, and present such an analogy to them that they could serve as their symbols in representing their resurrection to a glorious life. There is no corporeal change which any conscious agent passes through, that resembles the resurrection of dead saints to an immortal life, and could serve as a representation of it. There is no other agent besides man, that has a soul that survives its death, and in a state of consciousness. Search through the whole circuit of nature, and nothing can be found that presents any analogy to man in these conditions. There is no other symbol, therefore, that can possibly represent man in his disembodied state, but a disembodied soul itself; and no change through which such a soul can pass, that can symbolize the reunion of a disembodied soul to a living human body, but the actual reunion of such a soul to its body raised from death.

We have thus the most ample certainty, from the principle itself of symbolization, that the resurrection of the martyrs and other holy dead in the vision, was employed to symbolize the real resurrection of the holy dead at the commencement of the thousand years. The attempts of antimillenarian writers to wrest the vision from this meaning, treat it as figurative, and make it significant of the renovation of unbelievers, betrays a degree of error and inconsideration discreditable in the extreme to men who profess to be guided by the laws of symbols and language. They, in the first place, offer not a solitary reason drawn from the nature

of symbols and figures, to justify their construction of the vision, but rest it wholly on their mere arbitrary assertion. Next: They show an utter inacquaintance with the principles on which symbols and figures are employed, by confounding them, and asserting that the symbolic souls are here used figuratively, that is metaphorically, to denote a resembling change of the morally dead, or unbelieving and impenitent, to spiritual life. No one at all aware of the nature of symbols and figures would make such a blunder. For if the souls of the martyrs and other holy dead who were raised to life in the vision, were used on the principle of the agent or subject in a metaphor, it would follow that those identical martyrs and other souls that appeared in the vision, not other human individuals, are to be the subjects of the events that are foreshown by their resurrection and reigning. For it is a law of the metaphor, that the agent or object to which the figurative expression is applied, is the agent or subject of that which the metaphorical terms denote. Not a solitary instance in the whole compass of language can be found in which this law does not hold. Thus, when it is said, "the seas clap their hands," that is, throw up their waves and dash them against each other, as human beings raise and clap their hands, it is the seas, not anything else, that do that which is signified by the metaphorical expression; and when the rain is said to dance, that is, rebound from the surface on which it strikes, it is the raindrops themselves of which the movement is affirmed, which the term dance is used by a metaphor to denote; not anything else. If, then, the souls of the holy dead in the vision were used on the principle of the nominative of a metaphor, and their resurrection from death which they passed through in the vision, is simply equivalent, as these writers assert, to a metaphorical ascription to them of a corporeal resurrection, it follows that those identical souls themselves, not a different class, are to be the subjects of the event which that bodily resurrection is employed to signify. But that confutes their notion that the change which the resurrection of the vision denotes, is a moral change or renovation of the heart, inasmuch as the souls of the vision had already been renewed and accepted of God. It confutes their supposition, also, that those who were to be the subjects of the change denoted

by their resurrection, were a different class from the souls of the vision, and are the unbelieving and impenitent living. The assumption on which they proceed, thus, if admitted, instead of verifying, confutes their construction, as palpably as itself contradicts the laws of the vision. How long will it be before men who wish at least to be regarded as respectable scholars, will see that it must be wholly fatal to their aims to put forth constructions that betray such a total inacquaintance with the principles both of symbols and figures?

It is certain, then, from the nature of the case, that the resurrection of the holy dead in the vision, their session on thrones, and reigning with Christ, are representative of the real resurrection of the holy dead, their elevation to thrones, and a reign with Christ at the commencement of the thousand years; and they are used for that purpose, not only because there are no other symbols that could represent the holy dead passing through such changes, but because they are adapted to make the most impressive representation of *their* passing through it that is conceivable. The resurrection of the holy dead to immortal life, is to be the greatest, the most wonderful, and the most glorious event of their being. No change through which men pass here, bears any resemblance to its peculiarity, conspicuousness, and grandeur. The renovation of the mind, which many hold it is employed to represent, is totally unlike it, in that it is wholly invisible to men, and is unknown often even to the subjects of it at the time of its occurrence. In the order of its occurrence, also, it occupies the directly opposite place from that which those interpreters assign to it; for as the apostasy of the soul to sin is the antecedent and cause of the death of the body, so the renovation of the soul is a necessary antecedent and prerequisite of the resurrection of the body to a glorious life. A resurrection of the body cannot therefore be used as a symbol of the renovation of the soul. It were to reverse the order of nature and of grace, and make a consequent the representative of an antecedent, an effect the symbols of an indispensable condition of its own existence, which were absurd. No spectacle, however, could be so adapted to set forth the certainty and the grandeur of the resurrection of the holy dead, their elevation to thrones, and their reign with Christ, as the actual exhibition in a vision of the resur-

rection of a vast host of the holy dead in glory, their acceptance by Christ, and elevation to thrones to reign with him. With what a full and vivid conception of the event must it have filled the mind of the prophet? How utterly unnatural and impossible must it have been to him to regard it as signifying anything else than the real resurrection of the holy dead? And to what a strength of certainty must that conviction have been raised, when the revealing Spirit, or interpreting angel, announced to him that the resurrection in the vision was the symbol of the resurrection of the holy dead at Christ's coming; and that the rest of the dead were not to live till the thousand years were passed? "And they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not until the thousand years were finished. This [the vision of living souls, is the symbol of] the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

It is worse than vain to contend against the explanation which the Spirit has himself thus given of the vision. No language could more explicitly announce that it symbolizes the resurrection of the holy dead which is to take place at Christ's second coming; and utterly preclude the ascription to it of any other meaning. Every expression in the explanation indicates that it is the symbol of that real resurrection. It is expressly affirmed to be its symbol; for that is the meaning of the declaration, "This is the first resurrection." Those who have part in it, are represented as having part in the first resurrection, which were absurd, if that which the vision symbolizes were not the first resurrection. That it is the resurrection of the holy dead to glory, which the vision represents, is apparent also from the condition and character of those who have part in it. They are blessed and holy; which implies that they are accepted of God and have obtained their final reward, which is not to be given to the saints until their resurrection. It is implied also in the declaration that on them the second death hath no power; as the second death is not to be inflicted on the lost until they have been raised from the dead. And, finally, it is indicated by the declaration that they lived and reigned with

Christ the thousand years—a life and reign which none are ever to enjoy but the risen and glorified saints. The thousand years are a symbol of three hundred and sixty thousand. There is no reason to believe that individuals are to live in the natural body through that vast period. And men in the natural life are not to be priests of God and of Christ, and reign with him. That distinction is to belong to those only who are glorified. It was the living creatures and elders—the symbols of the holy dead in their intermediate state—who said that the Lamb had made them kings and priests unto God, and they *were to reign on the earth.* And it is after the event denoted by the descent of the New Jerusalem—the symbol of the risen and glorified saints—that those who have his name on their foreheads, and who are to see his face, are to reign for ever and ever. Rev. xxii. 3–5. Every part of the explanation of the vision thus either expressly declares or implies that it symbolizes the resurrection of the holy dead at Christ's coming.

And, finally, this construction is verified by the vision, which follows, of the resurrection of the unholy dead. The principle on which the symbols of these two visions are employed—that of representing themselves, or agents, conditions, and events of their own order—is identically the same, and for the same reason, that no others could foreshow the agents and events that were to be symbolized. Nothing but a resurrection of the lost could represent their real resurrection at a future period; nothing but the judgment of the lost and dejection into the lake of fire, could properly symbolize the judgment and destruction to which they are to be subjected on their being raised from the dead. As, therefore, in this vision of the last resurrection and judgment, the Judge, the throne on which he sat, the earth, the sea, death and hades, the dead, their resurrection from death, their standing at the tribunal, their being judged, and their dejection into the lake of fire, severally represent themselves; or show that the Judge is then to be visibly present, that the unholy dead are to be universally recalled from hades and reunited to their bodies raised from death, and that they are to be judged and consigned to destruction; so the symbols of the first resurrection are used in the same relation, and foreshow that the holy dead are in fact to be

raised in glory, accepted and exalted to thrones at the commencement of the thousand years, and are to reign with Christ on the earth during that period. The first can no more be wrested from this office and turned into a mere symbol of some vague, contradictious, and impossible meaning, than the last. But the last is admitted by antimillenarians to be a symbolization of a real resurrection of the dead, and on the principles on which we have interpreted both that and the first.

We have thus, in this vision of the rising and reigning martyrs and other holy dead, a most indubitable and impressive revelation, that the holy dead are to be raised in glory and immortality at the commencement of the thousand years, and are to reign with Christ during that period. But that makes it certain that his second coming is to take place at that epoch. It is implied in their reigning with him, as it is expressly shown (Rev. v. 10; xxii. 5); and is made certain by the revelation in other passages, that his coming in power and glory is to be at the time when he raises them from the dead. (1 Cor. xv. 22; 1 Thess. iv. 14–17.) And thence, as their resurrection is to precede the thousand years of their reign with him, his second coming is also to precede that period. This vision, thus, like the passages we have before considered, teaches in the most specific and emphatic form, that Christ's coming in the clouds, resurrection of his saints, and establishment of his throne on the earth, are to take place anterior to the thousand years, and not after that period.

It is revealed, also, indirectly (Rev. xi. 15–18) that the resurrection of the holy dead, and Christ's assumption of the sovereignty of the earth, are to take place at the time of the destruction of the antichristian powers at the sounding of the seventh trumpet. That that trumpet is immediately to precede the destruction of the hosts who are to be arrayed against Christ, and the commencement of the thousand years, is abundantly clear, and is universally admitted. But at the sound of that trumpet it was announced, not only that the sovereignty of the world had become Christ's, that he should reign for ever and ever, and that his wrath against the angry nations was come, by which he is to destroy them which destroy the earth—that is, the apos-

tate, usurping, and persecuting civil and hierarchical powers symbolized by the beast, false prophet, and their armies; but, also, that "the time of the dead had come to judge and give reward to God's servants, the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear his name, the small and the great." But the judgment and reward of the holy dead are not to take place till their resurrection. The time of the manifestation and adoption of the sons of God, is the time of the redemption of their bodies from the bondage of corruption. (Rom. viii. 17–23.) They are not to receive the crowns of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous judge, is to give them, till the great day of "his appearing." (2 Tim. iv. 8.) Their resurrection is accordingly to take place at the epoch of the seventh trumpet, when the angry nations are to be smitten, and the apostate powers, the great corrupters of the earth, are to be destroyed. And that is the time, also, when Christ is to assume the sceptre of the earth, and commence his eternal reign. His coming and assuming the dominion of the nations, the resurrection of the holy dead, and the destruction of the hosts that oppose his kingdom, it is thus again shown, are to be events of the same great epoch, the period of the seventh trumpet.

Their resurrection at that epoch is shown, also, in the annunciation (Rev. xix. 6–8) immediately after the destruction of the powers denoted by Babylon, that "the Lord God omnipotent reigns," and that "the marriage of the Lamb has come, and his wife has made herself ready, being arrayed in fine linen pure and white, which is the righteousness of the saints." The reign of the Lord God omnipotent is the reign of Christ as the King of kings, which is to commence at the sound of the seventh trumpet; and the marriage of the saints is their manifestation as the sons of God redeemed by him, by their resurrection in glory, their public acceptance, and their investiture as his kings and priests in his millennial kingdom. This is manifest from the fact that that, like the relation of a wife to her husband, is the highest relation they are ever to sustain to him; and is the relation which they are to sustain through their everlasting existence. (Rev. xxii. 5.) The announcement, therefore, immediately after the overthrow of Babylon, that the marriage of the Lamb has come, and his wife has prepared

herself, being publicly justified, is impliedly a revelation that the resurrection of the holy dead is to take place at that epoch, and is, therefore, like the coming and commencing reign of Christ and the destruction of the apostate church, to precede the thousand years.

And, finally, their resurrection at that period is indicated in the vision of the descent of the New Jerusalem from heaven, and the announcement that it is the tabernacle of God with men, and that he is then to dwell with them, and that they are to be his people, and "God himself shall dwell with them and be their God, and shall wipe all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away."—Rev. xxi. 2–4. For that new Jerusalem is declared (v. 9, 10) to be the bride, the Lamb's wife, the symbol of the risen and glorified saints; and their descent is to take place before the thousand years, inasmuch as they are to reign on the earth with Christ during that period. But they are not to reign with Christ until after their resurrection; as is shown by the vision of their resurrection and elevation to thrones in order to their reign with him during the thousand years (Rev. xx. 4–6); and is foreshown in Dan. vii. 13, 14, 18–27. Their resurrection is to precede their reign. Their reign is to commence at the investiture of the Son of man with the dominion of all nations; and that is to take place at the period of the seventh trumpet, and the destruction of the wild beast and false prophet. (Rev. xi. 15–18; Dan. vii. 9–14, 18, 22, 27.)

We are thus shown by this series of prophecies, some of which are conveyed through symbols, and some are expressed in language, that the epoch of the resurrection of the holy dead and of the destruction of the antichristian powers, is to be the same; and that they are to take place under the sound of the seventh trumpet, when Christ is to come in the clouds and establish his throne on the earth. Their revelation is clear and indubitable of this great certainty. No other construction can be placed on them without the grossest violation of the principles on which they are used. They are in harmony with all the other predictions of the sacred word on the subject; and neither any

necessity drawn from other teachings of the Scriptures, nor any rational motive exists for denying to them this, or assigning them any different meaning.

We shall resume the subject in the next number.

Art. V.—The Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures.

1. *An Essay on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, by John Dick, A.M. Third edition, with corrections and additions. Glasgow: 1813.
2. *The Books of the Old and New Testament* proved to be Canonical, and their Verbal Inspiration maintained and established, &c. By Robert Haldane, Esq. Third edition, much enlarged. Edinburgh: 1830.
3. *Lectures on the Inspiration of the Scriptures*, by Leonard Woods, D.D., Abbot Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: 1829.
4. *Divine Inspiration;* or, the Supernatural Influence exerted in the Communication of Divine Truth, and its Special Bearing on the Composition of the Sacred Scriptures. With Notes and Illustrations. By E. Henderson, D.D. Second edition. London: 1847.
5. *Theopneustia;* or, the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. From the French of L. Gaussen. London: 1841.
6. *Sontag* (Gust. Frid. Nicol.). Doctrina Inspirationis ejusque Ratio, Historia et Usus popularis. Heidelb.: 1810.
7. *Dullo* (H. F.). Ueber die Göttliche Eingebung des N. T. Jena: 1816.
8. *Elwert* (M.). Ueber die Lehre von der Inspiration, in Beziehung auf das Neue Testament, ein Versuch. Studien der Evangelischen Geistlichkeit Wirtembergs iii. b. 2. Heft.: 1831.

BY THE REV. J. W. HALL, D.D., ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI.

The great number of books that have appeared on the subject of this article, in this country, in Great Britain, and

on the continent of Europe, during the current century, shows how deep an interest is taken in its investigation by scholars and Christians. Is the Bible to be regarded as an inspired book, or not? and if it is, What is the *nature* and *extent* of its inspiration? are questions that are earnestly demanding to be solved in some satisfactory manner. These are already, or are rapidly becoming, *the* questions of the age, both among the sceptical and the serious. For as Dr. Henderson, in his preface to his work on Inspiration, remarks: "A spirit of universal inquiry has been awakened. The enemies of revealed truth are busily scattering the seeds of scepticism and infidelity. Lowering, or, to speak more properly, annihilating statements respecting the supernatural phenomena which the Scriptures exhibit, are liberally made by a pseudo-rational party of various grades and distinctions. Extravagant and untenable theories are advanced by some of the professed friends of revelation; while a revival of pretensions to inspiration and other miraculous endowments still continues, in some measure, to disturb the peace of the church." In this state of things, it is obvious that it is the bounden duty of every Christian, and especially of every Christian teacher, at the present time, to obtain as clear views as possible, both with regard to the fact and the nature of the inspiration of the Scriptures, not only that thereby his own mind may be at rest, but also, because it is evident that the views which one entertains of these subjects must essentially modify the influence which the Bible is to have not only upon his own creed and life, but upon his teachings also.

It may, indeed, be admitted, even apart from the thorough and old-fashioned conviction of the Divine inspiration of the Bible, that it may exert no slight influence upon the taste, the intellect, and the moral character of man; for it addresses itself to his whole nature, to his intellect, to his reason, to his imagination, to his conscience, his fears, his hopes, to all his faculties, and to all his feelings; and its communications are clothed in the richest and most attractive drapery of human speech. It is, to use the language of another,* "A mass of beautiful figures—its words and its

* Gilfillan.

thoughts are alike poetical—it has gathered around its central truths all natural beauty and interest—it is a temple with one altar and one God, but illuminated by a thousand varied lights, and studded by a thousand ornaments. . . . . It has pressed into its service the animals of the forest, the flowers of the field, the stars of heaven, all the elements of nature. The lion spurning the sands of the desert, the wild roe leaping over the mountains, the lamb led in silence to the slaughter, the goat speeding to the wilderness, the rose blossoming in Sharon, the lily drooping in the valley, the apple-tree bowing under its fruit, the great rock shadowing a weary land, the river gladdening the dry place, the moon and the morning star, Carmel by the sea, and Tabor among the mountains, the dew from the womb of the morning, the rain upon the mown grass, the rainbow encompassing the landscape, the light God's shadow, the thunder his voice, the wind and the earthquake his footsteps—all such varied objects are made as if naturally designed from their creation, to represent Him to whom the Book and all its emblems point."

Now a book so written—written in the language of the excited intellect and of the imagination, in their loftiest moods, and in the language of the deepest emotions and feelings of the human heart, and on subjects confessedly of the most intense interest within the compass of human thought or speculation, could not fail, one would think, even apart from the accompanying belief of its supernatural source, to make a decided impression upon the intellectual and moral character and tastes of the communities in which it circulates, and in which it is read. But then the "hiding of its power" is manifestly not in its literature or its logic, not in its philosophy or poetry, but in the deep conviction of its Divine inspiration. Take away this conviction, and it is at once shorn, not only of much of its majesty and grandeur, but of much, nay the chief part of its mighty and mysterious strength; and it becomes weak like another book, nay weaker perhaps, inasmuch as it appears in the absence of such a conviction, to have been claiming from us more of deference for its contents than it deserves; and so because we have come to think, that it claims more of us than it is entitled to, we are naturally tempted to yield less

to its intrinsic excellence than it deserves. But granting its divine inspiration, along with its confessed majesty and many excellences, and then its communications will come with their full weight of authority and power upon our spirits; now, gently like the still, silent influences of nature impressing and controlling us with a secret majesty and strength; and now, "like a mighty rushing wind," breaking down, and bearing away all our resistance to its commands, and compelling us, as it were, against all opposing obstacles to submit to its requirements. Hence, if we would read the Bible with profit, we must read it with a constant and reverent sense and awe of its inspiration; for then, and then only, may we expect it to be, what it was intended to be, "spirit and life," to our souls; and hence, also, it may be that the apostle Paul prefaces his statement of its uses, by a statement of its inspiration.*

In every examination of the subject under consideration, it is hardly necessary to say, that special attention ought to be directed to two passages of Scripture. The first is in Heb. i. 1, 2, where it is written, "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." The second is found in 2 Tim. iii. 16, where it is written, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." These are the two leading texts, which are to guide us in our investigation of the inspiration of the sacred Scriptures. They both affirm their supernatural source—the first, declaring that God hath *spoken* to our race through the lips of the prophets, and of his own Son; the second, that all Scripture [πᾶσα γραφὴ], every Scripture, "*Tota Scriptura V. T. est a Deo inspirata,*"† the whole of the Scriptures of the Old Testament is Theopneustic, or divinely inspired.

By "the Scripture" in this latter passage, strictly speaking, we are to understand the writings of the Old Testa-

---

* See 2 Tim. iii. 16. † Rosenmuller.

ment only, for when the apostle wrote the epistle from which it is taken, the new was not completed, parts of it only being as yet written. But still, as the New Testament is now uniformly regarded in the same light with respect to its origin with the old, there will be no impropriety in extending what the apostle here says of the writings of the Old Testament, to the writings of the new also. And, accordingly, when speaking of the Scriptures in this article, we shall wish to be understood as including both, and speaking of both.

Πάλαι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας [First Aor. participle, having spoken] τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν Υἱῷ. Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος. "God, having formerly spoken to the fathers by the prophets, in these last days hath spoken unto us by his Son. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, or is Theopneustic—divinely inspired." In these two passages we understand the *fact* of the *supernatural source* of the sacred Scriptures to be affirmed in the clearest language conceivable. The same fact is affirmed in different forms of speech in many other passages of Scripture. For instance, where it is said, that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Sometimes the statement is, that his Spirit was upon them, and his word was upon their lip—sometimes that they taught in the words of the Holy Ghost, &c. Now these statements convey very distinctly the idea of the supernatural source of the sacred Scriptures; and of the twofold agency that was concerned in their communication—the agency of God, and the agency of man; the agency of God in "breathing upon the minds of the sacred writers; or moving them to make their communications; or articulating their communications through their lips;" and the agency of man in writing, or speaking, under the inspiration or motion of God; or in speaking the words he put upon their lips.

The fact, then, that the Scriptures are a communication from God, through the agency of men, is as fully affirmed in the Scriptures themselves, as the fact likewise affirmed there, that the existence of the earth, and the heavens, and all the things that are therein is of God. The evidence of the truth of this fact we do not propose at present to lay

before our readers, it being our object, in this article, to inquire rather into the *nature and extent* of the inspiration that ought to be claimed for the Scriptures, than into the proofs that they are divinely inspired.

Several theories of inspiration have been proposed, each of which has, perhaps, a share of truth in it, more or less, and from each of which, therefore, we must take something, if we would render a full account of the entire phenomena of Bible inspiration; for even the most erroneous of these theories must have a measure of truth in it; for no error can stand without *some* spine of truth, however slender, to support it.

1. The first and the lowest of these theories is, that the inspiration of the sacred writers was but the inspiration of *genius*. Thus, Schleiermacher,* De Wette,† and many other German theologians, reject all miraculous inspiration, and attribute to the sacred writers only what Cicero attributes to the poets: *afflatum spiritus divini*, "a divine action of nature,—an interior power like the other vital forces of nature." So Theodore Parker and Mr. Foxton affirm, that the inspiration of Paul and Milton, or even of Christ and of Benjamin Franklin, is of the same nature, and in an intelligible sense from the same source, differing only in degree.‡ Now, according to this theory, the inspiration of the sacred writers differed in no respect from the inspiration of other men of genius, except in regard to the subjects treated; and in the degree of mental excitement which they experienced. Moses, Isaiah, David, and all the other sacred writers were certainly inspired, but then, in the same sense, so were Herodotus, Homer, and Virgil, and, indeed, so is every other writer whose mind kindles with his subject, and who, in the glow of his feelings, rises above the vulgar regions of thought and imagination; and who, when the spell is upon him, is wont to clothe his thoughts in the drapery of a rich and appropriate language.

Now, if it be meant merely to affirm, that many and the majority of the sacred writers were richly endowed by

---

* Schleiermacher der Christliche glaube, Band 1. 5. 115.

† De Wette Lehrbuch, Ammerk. &c., quoted by Gaussen, p. 32.

‡ See the Eclipse of Faith, p. 51.

nature with those peculiar qualities and susceptibilities of mind which constitute what we call genius, then this statement need not be denied, for, on the whole, we think that there is much evidence of its truth apparent in all their writings. But if it be meant to affirm, as the writers quoted above seem to hold, that they wrote under no other or higher impulse, or excitement, or aid, or inspiration, than that of their own genius, or under the guidance of no other or higher light than that of their own understandings or reason, then we must dissent from the statement altogether, for the plain and sufficient reason, that while it glorifies the natural gifts of the sacred writers, and, perhaps, affirms the truth in regard to the high natural endowments of many of them, it fails utterly to account for their unmeasured and unmeasurable superiority over all other writers, both in the *knowledge* and *prescience* of sacred things; and because it flatly contradicts the plain meaning of the apostle Peter, who says that they were moved, not by the fire of their own genius, but by the Holy Ghost; and the apostle Paul, who says, that he and his associates taught, not in the words which *man's wisdom* teacheth, but in the words which *the Holy Ghost* teacheth. While, therefore, we can, and we do admit, all that can be said truthfully in regard to the simplicity, beauty, sublimity, and unparalleled grandeur of the sacred writers, and while we grant that the true ore of natural genius shines everywhere in their writings, that the flowers of fine thought and feeling everywhere spring up, fresh and beautiful as those that come from the very bosom of nature itself; yet still we are compelled, from the continued references that they themselves make to God, as the author of their communications, to ascribe those communications, not to their unassisted powers alone, vast or vigorous as they may have been, but to that High Power, to whose perpetual presence there is constant reference made throughout the holy Scriptures. Instead, therefore, of saying that the sacred writers wrote as their natural powers of mind or genius dictated, and so making the Bible merely a human composition, as this theory manifestly does, when you have stripped the sayings of such writers, as we have referred to, of their poetical mist; we prefer ascribing to them all, the sort of inspiration which David, in the proem

to the sublime ode with which his poetical compositions terminate, claims for himself,

> "The *Spirit* of the Lord speaketh *in* me,
> And *his* word is upon my tongue."
>
> 2 Sam. xxiii. 2.

2. Another theory is, that inspiration is the natural result of moral goodness or holiness. This is the theory of "Moral Intuitions," "Spiritual Insight," "Inner Oracles," &c., &c., of which so much is said by such writers as Fr. Newman and Theodore Parker, *et id genus omne,* who deny the supernatural source of the sacred Scriptures in any true sense of language. It is also the theory of Morell, in his work on Christianity; and also, we fear, of Carlyle, so far as he has any fixed theory on the subject.

This theory begins with a fact which must, indeed, be granted by all who have reflected upon the subject, namely, that in proportion as men become morally good, and pure, and virtuous in their affections, in the same degree does their discernment of moral truth become clearer and clearer, and therefore, that as the sacred writers were for the most part pre-eminently pure and holy in the habitudes of their minds, so their discernment of divine things naturally became pre-eminently clear; and that thence they became qualified to speak with a clearness, and even with an authority, surpassing all other men (except, perhaps, Messrs. Parker and Newman themselves); but that in a degree all other men of genius and *goodness* have a similar discernment of moral and religious truth, and thence, a similar inspiration; and that, therefore, their teachings are entitled, in a degree, to similar confidence and authority with those of the sacred writers. The premises of this reasoning we need not deny. There is nothing new in it. The Pythagoreans were accustomed to affirm, that "Without a separation from the evil passions it was impossible to philosophize well," χωρισμον απο των σωματος, εις το καλως φιλοσοφειν,—and in view of the same fact upon which this Pythagorean maxim was founded, the ancient Jews were accustomed to say, that "Among the passions, the Holy Spirit could not dwell." *In passionibus, Spiritus sanctus non habitat.* And founded upon the same discovery of the intimate connexion that there is between purity of

heart and the perception of moral truth, is that fine piece of advice which Boethius gives to the student of ethics:—

> "Tu quoque, si vis lumine claro
> Cernere verum, gaudia pelle,
> Pelle timorem; nubila mens est,
> Vinctaque frœnis, hæc ubi regnant." *

The same doctrine abounds in the Bible. "The path of the *just* is as a shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." "Blessed are the *pure* in heart, for they shall *see* God." "If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light." "If any man will do the will of my Father, he shall know of the doctrine." Now it is quite evident from all these passages of Scripture, that the clear discernment of moral and religious truth depends very much upon purity of heart, and holiness of life; and that, therefore, as the sacred writers were pre-eminently pure and holy, as St. Peter affirms that they were, when speaking of their inspiration, so it may be affirmed without doubt, that their views of divine truth were pre-eminently clear and distinct. But then we do not see how any amount, or degree of purity, or goodness, could have enabled them to discover without supernatural aid, many, very many, of the things that are revealed in the sacred Scriptures; as for instance, several of the things which are revealed concerning the nature and perfections of God, the way of salvation through the Mediator, the mysteries concerning a future state, and especially, we do not see what power there is either in purity or goodness, to foresee and foretell the course of events, age after age, before their coming, as this course of events is evidently foreseen, and is foretold in the sacred writings. While, therefore, we may and do grant that purity of heart, and pre-eminent piety, may and do enable men to discern more clearly the moral meaning of truths that are *already* revealed to them, we do not see how those, or any

---

* Wouldst thou the truth in light unclouded gaze?
Shun boisterous pleasure, and from fear keep free;
For where they reign, the soul a thickening haze
Wraps, as a storm enshrouds the heaving sea.

other moral excellences of character, could inform the understanding in regard to truths that are utterly unknown. They may induce men earnestly and honestly to seek the truth—they may clarify the atmosphere of the mind, but it is not seen how they are to furnish it with objects of vision. As, then, this theory of inspiration is *inadequate* to account for its phenomena, we dismiss it, granting only this part to be true, viz. that it was holy men that spake, but not as they were moved to speak by either their own purity or goodness merely, but also, as they were "moved by the Holy Ghost."

3. There is another and a more common theory of inspiration, which approximates more nearly, as we think, to the truth, but which is not entirely in accordance with the simple statements of the Bible. This theory is well stated by Gaussen, in his work on inspiration, thus:* "Others, like Michaelis,† and, as formerly, Theodore of Mopsuestia, while fully admitting the existence of an inspiration, are unwilling to acknowledge it, for more than a part of the holy books; for the first of the fourth Evangelist, for example, for a part of the Epistles, for a part of Moses, a part of Isaiah, a part of Daniel. These portions of the Scriptures, say they, are from God, the others from men."

"The third class, as Mr. Twesten, in Germany, and as many theologians in England,‡ extend, it is true, the notion of a Theopneusty to all parts of the Bible, but not to *all equally* (nicht gleich inässig). Inspiration, according to them, is indeed universal, but unequal; often imperfect, accompanied by innocent errors; and extended, according to the nature of the passages, to very different degrees, of which they constitute themselves the judges.

"Many of them, especially in England, have divided inspiration into four kinds—inspiration of *superintendence*, by which the sacred authors have been continually preserved from grave errors, in everything which relates to faith and spiritual life; inspiration of *elevation*, by which the divine Spirit, in raising the thoughts of the men of God to the

---

* Gaussen on the Inspiration of the Bible, page 31.

† Michaelis, Introduction to New Testament.

‡ Drs. J. Pye Smith, Dick, Wilson.

purest regions of truth, has indirectly impressed the same characters of holiness and grandeur on their words; inspiration of *direction*, under the more powerful action of which the sacred writers were guided by God, both as to the selection and rejection of topics and thoughts; finally, inspiration of *suggestion*. Here, they say, all the thoughts, and even the words, were given by God, through a still more direct and energetic operation of his Spirit."

We will not say with Mons. Gaussen, that "All these distinctions are fanciful," but will say with him, that "The church of the first eight centuries of the Christian era knew nothing of them;" and we will add, further, that they are not in accordance with the Jewish doctrine of inspiration previously to, and contemporaneously with, the Christian era, and even down to the present time. Josephus says that the prophets composed the twenty-two sacred books of the Old Testament, and that they wrote after the inspiration which comes from God. Κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. Substantially the same doctrine, with regard to the inspiration of the sacred writers of the Old Testament, was held by Philo, a learned Jew, who flourished at Alexandria in the time of Christ and his apostles, and also by Rambam, or Moses Maimonides, who flourished in Egypt, in the latter half of the twelfth century.*

Our objection to these distinctions, with regard to the different kinds and degrees of inspiration, under which the Scriptures are supposed to have been written, does not arise from their *novelty* merely, but it arises rather from the fact, first, that they make a difference in regard to the manner of inspiration under which different parts of the Scriptures were written, which the sacred writers do not make. Secondly, this theory of different kinds of inspiration denies to God the proper authorship of all the Scriptures. Let us illustrate this latter point. Suppose that a number of men should write a history of England, and submit its successive chapters to the inspection of Macaulay, and that he should run his pen over a word here, or a sentence there, or prune it of a superfluous paragraph in one place, or direct additions

* See Henderson on Inspiration, Introd. Lec., pp. 37, 38, 39, 40, where the Jewish doctrine of inspiration is fully stated.

to be made in another place, or suggest certain moral reflections to be introduced at the close of one chapter, or dictate in his own language something to be said here and there throughout the whole book; in a word, suppose that he should exercise over the preparation of the whole history for the press, the most vigilant supervisorship, in the manner already described; still it could not with truth be said to be *his* history, still less that it was written *under the influence* of his mind or genius. So it seems to us that if God did nothing more than superintend, *in a similar manner*, the composition of the Bible, it cannot be claimed that he is the author of all of it, at least, in any proper sense of language; and much less can it be said with truth, that it is "*all* Theopneustic, or divinely inspired." To be his book, to be said with truth to be inspired by him, whatever there is in the book, whether it be history, or biography, or genealogical tables, or moral precepts, or sacred songs, or parables, or prophecies, or whatever else it contains, must be there, and just in the form, and order, and language, that it is there, because he so ordered it, and had it so put down; let this, all this, be granted, and it then can be truly said to be "the Word of God"—His Book—no matter what or whence the matter which it contains, or who or how many writers were employed in its preparation, or how many years, or even centuries, it was in composing. So we say that a certain book lying on our table is Macaulay's History of England, although upon examination we find that its contents were gathered from a great number of sources, although he has chosen to interweave with the thread of his own narrative, many anecdotes, biographical sketches, genealogies, statistics, quotations from the poets, and from other authors; still we say that it is *his* history, because the whole of the two volumes has taken the form that they have as to their matter, order of arrangement, style, language, everything pertaining to them, under the plastic power of his own mind, and judgment, and feelings; they are his—every chapter, paragraph, sentence, and syllable, because, if you please to say so, they were written under the *inspiration of his own genius.* Nor would it in the least diminish his claims to their authorship, if it could be affirmed that in the mechanical part of their preparation, he had employed the hands of

half a dozen, or a dozen, or fifty scribes, either in collecting the matter of them, or reducing them to writing, no more than the fact that Milton employed the hands of his daughters in writing Paradise Lost, interferes with the fact universally conceded, that he is the author of that sublime poem, or, which is still more to the point, the fact that Prescott employed both readers and amanuenses in preparing his Ferdinand and Isabella, and his Conquests of Mexico and Peru, for the press, interferes with the fact, that he, and he only, is the author of those charmingly written histories.

But it may be asked if we assign so subordinate a place to the sacred writers in furnishing us with the Bible, as these illustrations indicate; if, in other words, they were but the instruments of a higher power, then how do we account for what may be denominated the personality and peculiarity of each sacred writer's style? When Milton, or Prescott, or Macaulay, employed scribes to put down their thoughts, there was nothing left in the writings of these scribes to identify one or another of them, or to distinguish one from another; there is nothing more seen of any of them, on the face of these compositions, than there is of the different pens with which they wrote. But it is not so in the Bible. The style of each sacred scribe is preserved throughout. Here is the simple, plain, majestic style of Moses, as marked and as peculiar as that of Herodotus or Homer; here is David's style, in every Psalm from the first, in which he celebrates the blessedness of "the man that walketh not in the counsels of the ungodly," to the last, in which he celebrates the praise of God for his "mighty acts and his excellent greatness." So in each sacred book, we recognise the personality of each writer, just as easily, and just as certainly, as we recognise the personality of any authors, ancient or modern, with which we are intimately acquainted. How, admitting all this to be true—admitting that they were but the instruments of a higher power—are these facts to be accounted for? This is a deeply interesting inquiry, and our answer to it is, that the diversity of style which is seen in the Bible, notwithstanding the proper oneness of its authorship, is to be found in the very fact that this one invisible author employed *different instruments* in the communication of his will. Suppose that you were about to make a communication to

three or half a dozen different persons, of different mental capacities, modes of thinking, &c., &c., which you wished them to understand perfectly, and to reduce to writing; the question we propose is, whether you would dictate to them in your *own* language, or whether you would not rather dictate to them in *theirs*, using the very kinds of words, figures, similes, &c., in which *they*, and not yourself, were accustomed to think and speak? The answer certainly is, that if you wished to be *understood* by them perfectly, you would use *their* language, style, &c., and not your *own;* but if so, then it is plain that when each of them had reduced the communication to writing, it would be just as distinctively marked by the peculiarity of each of the writers, as if each had composed it without a single thought or suggestion from you. The application of this illustration to the case in hand I need not make. Whitby remarks,* "that some illustration of the assistance of the Holy Spirit may be made from the analogy it bears to human conversation, thus: That as we convey our thoughts one to another by such words as, by the organs of hearing, make such a motion on their brain to whom we speak, as gives them an idea of the words we utter, and by them of the things which by those words are signified; and so it is the impression made upon their brain, which doth communicate our thoughts to them; so, when it pleaseth God to reveal his will to any person, it seemeth only necessary that he talk inwardly with them, that is, that he make such a motion on their brains as giveth them a deep and clear idea of that which he intended to make known unto them."

Now allow that God, *thus*, in times past, spake to the fathers by the prophets, and also admit the further analogy that in communicating to them he would do as men always do when they wish to be understood; namely, adapt their language, illustrations, &c., to the capacity of those whom they address,—whether children, servants, or princes,—and then it seems to us that we shall be able, while holding to the full inspiration of every part of the Bible, to understand how the style of each sacred writer must be different, and

* See Whitby on the Divine Authority of the Scriptures of the New Testament. General Preface to his Commentary on the New Testament.

how the personality of each one must be preserved in its minutest shades. Indeed we do not see how it could be otherwise, if, as the apostle says, He spake to man *through* the prophets; for they were not mere amanuenses, but messengers; and so as God communicated to them in their *own* language and ways of thinking, so they must have spoken to us in that very language and way of thinking, and in no other; and thus each must have left the traces of his own individuality, whether of goodness, or genius, or language, or any other personal peculiarity, deeply imprinted upon his writings, while it was God's Spirit that excited, guided, directed, suggested, communicated with them all, and through them all, throughout.

Take another analogy to illustrate this point. Light is one of the images by which the influence of the Spirit is set forth. Suppose, then, the same light to fall upon a thousand different objects, the *color* which is reflected from each, we know, will be different, being determined as to its diversity of hues by the peculiarity of each reflecting surface on which it happens to fall. For it is the character of each reflecting surface that determines the *color* of the light as it comes to us—just so it ought to be in the case before us. If the light of the Holy Spirit was the same as it shone upon the mind of each of the sacred writers, the peculiar structure of each of their minds ought, according to analogy, to have determined the peculiar style and color of their thoughts as they come reflected to us through the medium of their language and the imagery which they employed. And just as we might from analogy have expected, so it is. The light of inspiration falls on the minds of all the sacred writers, but each one reflects it in his own, and in a different style from every other.

Take another illustration. The Spirit is compared to the wind, but the wind, we know, in passing through a forest of pines, or oaks, or a thicket of aspens, gives forth a different sound in its passage through each. So in passing through the different pipes and stops of an organ, it gives forth different sounds, the peculiar shape and structure of each pipe and stop determining the different styles or diversities of sound which we hear; and just so, according to analogy, in the one before us. Although the breath, or the

impulse of inspiration, is the same that passes over the mind of each sacred writer, and stirs or exerts it, yet the structure of their minds being different, their habits of thought being different, their association of ideas being different, their modes of thinking, feeling, and expressing their thoughts and feelings all being different, it would seem a matter of absolute necessity, that each should give forth the suggestive communications made to him, in his own way and style of thinking and speaking, and not in that of another, and so the personality and peculiarity of each one's style must be preserved throughout, notwithstanding the fact that it was the same Spirit that was breathing upon all, communicating to all, and through all, equally and alike. And thus we account for the fact that each one of them gives forth the communication with which he is charged, in his own peculiar tone, and style, and coloring, and costume of language and imagery. It is the Spirit of God that is on all, and it is the mind and the message of God that is on the lip, or at the end of the stylus of each, but it is so marked, and colored, and toned by the medium through which it comes to us, that the very mind, and soul, and almost the very outward features of the man through whom it comes, seem to be enstamped upon it. Hence in the language of Henderson,* we have "the antique simplicity and energy of Moses; the feeling and gracefulness of David; the sententiousness and eloquence of Solomon; the majesty and sublimity of Isaiah; the sensibility and plaintiveness of Jeremiah; the magnificence and solemnity of Ezekiel; the argumentativeness and vehemence of Paul; and the tenderness and affection of the disciple whom Jesus loved." They have each his own peculiar character—a character which they have in so remarkable a degree communicated to their writings, that it furnishes one of the most striking and satisfactory evidences of their authenticity. They severally exhibit a distinctness of cast or manner, which, nevertheless, in each is perfectly natural—being that which exactly agrees with our historical knowledge of his times and circumstances.

This, then, is our conclusion in regard to the inspiration

---

* See Henderson on Inspiration, 2d Edition, London. 1847, pp. 336, 337.

of the sacred Scriptures; the Holy Spirit communicated the matter of them to the sacred writers, and to each the part which he was to write, in the very language, imagery, &c., in which he was accustomed to think and speak, and excited them all to reduce to writing what he thus communicated to them, for the perpetual instruction of our race. Such we believe to have been the origin of the Bible, according to the plain teachings of the Bible itself, and the early faith both of Jews and Christians. It was from God; hence its enduring authority in matters of faith and practice. It was through man, hence its adaptation to instruct man, to convince his reason, to quicken and rectify his conscience, to reach his feelings and emotions. It came through different classes of men, kings, herdsmen, physicians, fishermen—all classes of men, hence its diversities of style, and its adaptation to the capacity of all classes.

The discussion of our subject would be defective, if we did not notice what the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, in regard to the sundry times and divers manners in which God formerly spake to the fathers by the prophets, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως—"in many parts, or portions, and in many ways." This, we think, is the true translation of these words. And the facts in the case correspond with this translation. For the Scriptures were not given all at once, but in many parts. The first communication from God which is put upon record, was probably made to "Enoch, the seventh from Adam;" and the last to the apostle John on the "Island called Patmos;" an interval of time between these communications, spanned by three thousand years, but during all that long period the matter of the Bible was constantly accumulating, portion after portion being given. Thus the materials of this great temple of divine truth were gradually contributed, and it was going up, course after course, from the time that its broad foundations were laid by Moses, until the glorious hieroglyphic cap-stone was put upon it by the Apocalypse of St. John; each builder in this temple making his contribution, greater or less, to its growth, but all under the silent inspection, and guidance, and superintendence of the great, ever present, inspiring, but invisible Architect.

Thus the Bible, which is the finished temple of divine

truth, came by slow degrees and gradual accretions, to be the congenial home that it is, for all that is sacred and spiritual in the nature of man. Its preparation for this purpose follows all analogy. Thus our globe was gradually prepared for man's habitation. First, there was mere matter, then matter rounded into form and put into the shape of land and seas, and a firmament overstretching both, then vegetable life, then animal life, rising higher and higher in the scale of perfection, until

> "Lastly . . . . came man,
> Glorious and perfect from his Maker's hand,
> Then soft and beautiful as music's close,
> Angelic woman into being rose."

And so this pair of perfect beings, the parents of our race, took their place in the paradise that was prepared for them, "the most beautiful spot in a beautiful world," while the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy in beholding the loveliness of the material abode which God had been gradually preparing for them.

This analogy between the progress of nature and the progress of revelation in coming to completion, the one for the support and comfort of man's physical, the other for the instruction and comfort of his spiritual nature, is certainly striking; and if it does not evince, it certainly suggests, that they both had the same author—the one being accomplished by successive fiats of the divine will from time to time, and through the agency, in a measure, of what we call natural causes—the other being accomplished by successive inspirations of his Spirit from time to time, also acting upon and through the agency of holy men.

But the Scriptures were not only given in different parts or at "sundry times," as we have it in our translation, but also in "many ways" or "in divers manners." This statement also corresponds with the facts in regard to the various or many ways, through which, as we learn from the Scriptures themselves, God communicated his will. Henderson sums up these various ways thus: "From a collection of the statements furnished upon this subject in both divisions of the sacred volume, it will be found that the modes of divine revelation, or the exertion of inspiring influence which it

pleased the author of all wisdom to select, are the following: *direct internal suggestion; audible articulate sounds; the Urim and Thummim; dreams; visions; and the re-appearance of the departed.*"* Let us expand what is here said.

Internal suggestion, as when David says: "The Spirit of the Lord speaketh *in* me, and his work is upon my tongue," 2 Sam. xxiii. 2, and also what is said in John xvi. 26; Matt. x. 20; 1 Peter i. 11.

Audible and articulate sounds, as in Numbers vii. 89, viii. 1; Exod. xxv. 22; Numb. xii. 8; Dan. iv. 31; Matt. xvii. 5, &c., &c.

The Urim and Thummim, Exod. xxviii. 29, 30; Lev. viii. 5–9; Numb. xxvii. 21.

Dreams, as in the case of the two Josephs—Joseph the son of Jacob, and Joseph the husband of Mary, the mother of our Lord.

Visions, as in the case of Ezekiel and Paul, and others.

The re-appearance of the departed, as in 1 Sam. xxviii.

But the "divers manners," or "many ways," may not only refer to these several methods in which God chose to communicate his will, but also to the several species of composition in which he chose that it should be embodied. Sometimes it is communicated in simple annals and biographies, as we see in a portion, and even a large portion, of the five books of Moses; sometimes in history, as in Judges, Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, &c.; sometimes in poetry, as in the Book of Job, in the Psalms, and in the Song of Songs; sometimes in pithy sayings, as in the Proverbs of Solomon; sometimes in prophecy, as we find in large portions of the writings of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, and indeed throughout both the Old Testament and the New; sometimes in parables, as in the teachings of our Lord; sometimes in allegories; sometimes in sermons; sometimes in epistles; indeed every form of composition may be found in the sacred writings from the plainest narratives up to the sublimest flights of poetry and prophecy.

And as we have every form of composition, so we have every kind of *style* of writing in the Bible—the plain,

* Henderson on Ins., 2d Ed., London: 1847.

the terse, the pathetic, the figurative—thus naturally suggesting that God intended to adopt the very style of his communications to every taste, and to address himself to every feeling and faculty of the intellectual and moral nature of man, that was to be moved or moulded by it, that thereby he might have all classes of men to receive instruction, and bring them all under the plastic influence of that word which is ordained to be the wisdom of God, and the power of God, to those who shall receive it.

But still, whatever may be the form or the style of the composition, it is all of the inspiration of God, and alike of his inspiration. There were divers times in which it was given, divers methods in which it was communicated, and there are diversities of matter and manner—differences of style, and diversities of human agency and authorship, but still it is the same Spirit that worketh all in all. *So* nature reveals God to his intelligent creatures; for it reveals him to them in "divers manners," or in many ways; now in the rose that hangs in its beauty in the garden, and now in the star that sparkles on the brow of the evening, as the night shades are gathering when thousands more are to come forth to proclaim his infinite power and wisdom, and goodness, and greatness. Here on earth we daily see these attributes in the curious mechanism of all living creatures, and above in the magnificent mechanism of the heavens. Every object in the universe, like every word and chapter in the Bible, reveals him; but, like them, they reveal him in "divers manners."

May we all learn to see him, both in his works and word, and learn to adore him as he is harmoniously revealed in both; and in the language wherewith Henderson closes his able and learned work on the Inspiration of the Scripture:—"May HE of whom the Scriptures testify, and to glorify whom the Spirit under whose inspiration they were written, continues his gracious and saving influences, be all our salvation and all our desire! May we enjoy the perpetual tuition of that blessed teacher! that we may grow wise unto salvation, through God speaking to us in *his* Word."

Art. VI.—A Designation and Exposition of the Figures of Isaiah, Chapters XXV. and XXVI.

CHAPTER XXV.

This chapter consists first of a hymn of acknowledgment and praise by the prophet for the judgments and deliverances foreshown in the preceding chapter; a further prediction of blessings God will then bestow on all nations from Mount Zion; and the perfect conquest and subjection of one of the principal enemies of Israel. The period to which the prophecy refers, it was shown in the exposition of chap. xxiv., is that of the last judgments on the nations, and Christ's second coming.

1. A metaphor in the use of exalt. "O Jehovah, thou art my God, I will exalt thee. I will praise thy name; for thou hast accomplished a wonder, counsels of old, (with) faithfulness and truth," v. 1. To exalt, literally, is to elevate to a higher place. The verb is here used by a metaphor to denote the celebration of the acts of Jehovah by which the greatness and sublimity of his perfections are shown forth.

2. Metonymy in the use of Jehovah's name for Jehovah himself.

Counsels of old, or from afar, are counsels that were formed and revealed a long period before their accomplishment. They are to be executed in such a manner as to display God's faithfulness and truth. Every feature in the great picture he has drawn in the revelations he has made of his purposes respecting the destruction of his enemies and the redemption of his people, will appear in the clearest outline in the event, and will excite the wonder, awe, and admiring acknowledgments of all his holy subjects. This accords with the celebrations in the Apocalypse, in which immediately anterior to the infliction of the last plagues, those who have obtained a victory over the beast, over its image, and over its mark, are exhibited as standing on the sea of glass, having the harps of God, and singing the song of Moses and the song of the Lamb. "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty, just and true are

thy ways, thou King of saints! Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? For thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before thee; because thy judgments are made manifest."—Rev. xx. 2–4. In like manner, after the destruction of Babylon, the symbol of the apostate hierarchies, the hosts of heaven are exhibited as uttering a similar celebration. "And I heard a great voice of much people in heaven saying: Alleluia; Salvation, and glory, and honor, and power, unto the Lord our God; for true and righteous are his judgments; for he hath judged the great harlot that did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, Alleluia, and her smoke rose up for ever and ever. And the four and twenty elders and the four living creatures fell down and worshipped God that sat on the throne, saying, Amen, Alleluia." A voice then proceeding from the throne summoned all the servants of God on the earth to repeat the ascription. "Praise our God all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. And I heard, as it were, the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Let us rejoice and give honor to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come." Rev. xix. 1–7. The demonstration of God's justice, truth, sanctitude, and wisdom in the whole scheme of his administration both towards the apostate powers and towards his people, are to be such as to silence for ever every cavil, extinguish doubt, and raise the holy of every order alike in heaven and on earth to a rapture of wonder, adoration, and love.

The prophet next specifies, in a measure, the nature of the wonders which God is to work; the demolition of cities, fortresses, and palaces; implying, as is indicated in the preceding chapter, that it is to be wrought by an earthquake. "For thou hast changed the city from being one, to a heap; the fortified town to a ruin; the palace of strangers from being a city; it shall never be built," v. 2.

3, 4, 5. Synecdoches, in the use of the city, the fortified town, and the palaces, for cities, fortified places, and palaces of strangers generally, indicating that the devastation, instead of being confined, as some have supposed, to a single

capital, as Babylon, or Nineveh, is to extend to many. This accords with the predictive description, chap. xxiv. 12, that the city is left a desolation, and the gate is smitten with destruction; and with the prophecy, chap. ii. 15–21, that the day of the Lord of hosts shall be upon every high tower and upon every fenced wall; and the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and the haughtiness of men shall be brought low, and the Lord alone shall be exalted; and that "that day" is to be the day when "he ariseth to shake terribly the earth," and when men "shall go into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth for fear of the Lord and for the glory of his majesty;" which implies that Jehovah is then visibly to reveal himself; and the time, we learn from Rev. vi. 15–17, is to be that of Christ's second coming and the destruction of the apostate hosts. There is to be an earthquake, therefore, in which not only the cities and fortified places of Palestine are to be thrown down, but the palaces, also, of foreigners, who are then to be in possession of that country, and pitch their tents between the sea and Zion, the glorious holy mountain. Zech. xiv. 4–11; Dan. xi. 45.

6, 7. Synecdoches in the use of the people and the city, for peoples and cities. "Therefore the strong people shall honor thee; the city of the terrible nations shall fear thee," v. 3. These are, doubtless, put for the nations and cities of God's enemies that are to survive those judgments. Overawed by the demonstrations of his presence and majesty, they are to acknowledge and give glory to his name. This is implied also, chap. xi. 10–12; lxvi. 18–24; and Zech. xiv. 15–21; and is expressly foreshown in Rev. xv. 4, as the effect of the last plagues. "Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? For all nations shall come and worship before thee, for thy judgments are made manifest."

8, 9, 10, 11, 12. Metaphors in the use of stronghold, refuge, shadow, and blast or wind. "For thou hast been a stronghold to the poor, a stronghold to the needy in his distress, a refuge from the storm, a shadow from the heat, so that the blast" or wind "of the terrible ones was as a storm against the wall," v. 4. God is said to have been a stronghold, a refuge, and a shadow to the poor and needy, to signify that he had defended and protected them amidst the

dangers and sufferings of that last great conflict—as effectually as a fortress protects those within from the assaults of enemies without, and as a shadow shields those on whom it is cast from the rays of the sun. The onset of their enemies is called a wind or blast, to denote its resemblance to a furious tempest.

13. Comparison of the onset denominated the wind or blast of the terrible ones, to a storm against a wall, to signify that violent and terrific as it is to be, God is to prevent it from reaching his people against whom it is to be directed, as a storm that beats against the wall of a dwelling, wastes its rage there without reaching those who are sheltered within.

14. 15. Comparisons. "As heat in a drought (a dry place) the noise of strangers thou wilt bring down; (as) heat by the shadow of a cloud shall the song of the terrible ones be brought low," v. 5. The object of the comparison seems to be to indicate the suddenness with which the clangor of the enemy in their onset is to be arrested, and their chant, or shout of victory, hushed. As an overshadowing cloud instantly mitigates the heat occasioned by the glare of the sun on a dry field, or a waste of sand, and gives relief, so the clamor of the attacking host, and their shout of victory, are to be instantaneously arrested, by the visible interposition of the Almighty, and a joyous sense of deliverance take possession of the hearts of his people. In the first comparison, the means by which heat in a dry place is brought down, that is the shadow of a cloud, is to be supplied from the second.

16. 17. Hypocatastases in the substitution of bring down, and brought low, which literally signify a movement from a higher to a lower place, for an analogous reduction in the degrees of strength or intensity. To bring down a heat or noise, is to diminish its force. The strangers whose clamor is to be hushed, are the foreigners who are then to assault Jerusalem.

18. 19. Hypocatastases in the substitution of a feast of flesh, and a feast of wine, for the spiritual gifts that are, after the conquest of the antichristian hosts, to be bestowed on the surviving nations. "And in this mountain, Jehovah of hosts shall make unto all people a feast of fat things, a

feast of wines on the lees; of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined," v. 6. The mountain where this feast is to be spread, is Mount Zion, in Jerusalem. The last clause is supplemental of the first, the sense being the same as though the arrangement had been: a feast of fat things, of fat things full of marrow; a feast of wines on the lees, of wines on the lees well refined. These richest and most grateful aliments of the body are put for the resembling means of spiritual life that are then to be conferred on the nations. They are used by the figure also, chap. iv.; John vii. 27; 1 Corin. iii. 2. The passage clearly and beautifully signifies that the greatest and most life-sustaining spiritual blessings are to be conferred on the nations, after the overthrow of the apostate hosts. What those gifts are to be, is indicated in the next verse.

20. 21. 22. 23. Metaphors in the use of swallow, face, covering, and veil. "And he will swallow up in this mountain the face of the covering veil upon all people, and the covering spread over all nations," v. 8. Face is used by an elliptical metaphor for front. Veil and covering are employed by the same form of the figure also; an affirmation being implied that there is, in fact, a veil that envelopes all people, and a covering that is spread over all nations, to denote an analogous obstacle within them to their discernment of spiritual things; and that veil and covering, it is declared by a full metaphor, God will swallow up, that is, destroy, as though they were engulphed in an abyss. This indicates that the great obstruction within them to the knowledge of God, is then to be removed by him from all nations;—blindness, unbelief, false notions, perverseness—so that the light of truth will shine without hindrance in its full-orbed splendors.

24. Metaphor in the use again of swallow up. "He will swallow up death in victory," v. 8. That is, in the victory God is then to achieve by raising his saints from the grave, death itself will be swallowed up, as though it were buried in the sepulchre, or precipitated into the gulf of hades. That the resurrection of the holy dead is the victory by which death is to be swallowed up, is seen 1 Corin. xv. 54, in which the apostle declares, that "when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality," which is to take place at the resurrection of the saints,

posing, and conferring the salvation he is to bestow, are then to be the characteristics of those whom he redeems. "And it shall be said in that day, Lo this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; we have waited for him; we will be glad, and rejoice in his salvation," v. 9. This shows that before Christ's advent, the sanctified are to be brought to the belief that he is about to come, destroy the persecuting powers, raise his saints, assume the sceptre of the earth, convert the nations, and transform the world to a paradise, and are to wait for these events in the joyful assurance that they shall witness and share in them.

27. Hypocatastasis in using the act of resting the hand on Mount Zion, to denote God's continued presence and activity there. "For on this mountain the hand of Jehovah shall rest," v. 10. Mount Zion is therefore to be the special scene of his manifested presence and agency. This accords with the representation, chap. iv. 28, and other passages, that Jehovah of hosts is then to reign there before his elders gloriously.

28, 29. Hypocatastases. "And Moab shall be trodden down under him, even as straw is trodden down on a dunghill, and he shall spread forth his hands in the midst of it, as a swimmer spreadeth forth his hands to swim," v. 11. Treading down is put by substitution for the various acts of providence, by which the inhabitants of Moab will be overthrown and subdued; and their spreading their hands in that prostrate position, is put for the indications they are to give that they feel their condition to be hopeless. A person thrown to the ground, who merely spreads out his hands, shows that he is unable to rise.

30. Metonymy of Moab, for the inhabitants of that country.

31, 32. Comparisons of the mode in which they are to be trodden down by the Most High, to the treading of straw on a dunghill; and of their spreading their hands in their prostrate condition, as a swimmer spreads his; indicating their utter helplessness and despair, as otherwise they would endeavor to rise to their feet, and renew the conflict, or seek to escape by flight.

"And he [Jehovah] shall humble his pride, together with the spoils of his hands, and the fortress of the high fort of

thy walls shall he bring down, lay low, and bring to the ground,—to the dust," v. 11, 12. Their pride and self-reliance because of their former achievements, are to be for ever confounded and extinguished; their loftiest and strongest fortress, which they regarded as impregnable, is to be levelled with the earth, and not a trace of their power remain.

CHAPTER XXVI.

This chapter consists of a hymn of joy, confession, and commemoration, and a further prediction of Jehovah's coming to punish his enemies.

1. Hypocatastasis in the substitution of a fortified city for the defences which Jehovah is to give. "In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah; We have a strong city. Help will he constitute walls and a bulwark," v. 1. The figure of a fortified city to represent the means God is to employ for their deliverance, is used to contrast the certainty of their safety, with the ruin of their enemies. The strongest fortress of Moab is to be levelled with the dust, and those who look to it for safety, are to be trodden down in helplessness. The people of God, on the contrary, are to be as secure as though lodged in an impregnable fortress. That this is the relation in which the strong city is employed is seen from the explanatory declaration that the help Jehovah is to give, he will constitute walls and a bulwark.

2, 3. Metaphors in denominating help, walls and a bulwark. It is Jehovah alone who is to protect them, not fortifications or arms.

4, 5. Hypocatastases. "The gates are opened that the righteous nation keeping faith may enter in," v. 2. The opened gates, and entrance of the righteous into the city, are put for the analogous conditions and acts by which they are to become partakers of the help which God is to make walls and a bulwark to them. This is confirmed by the next verse, in which the certainty is proclaimed, that those who trust in God will be preserved in peace. "The mind that (is) stayed (or fixed) thou wilt preserve in perfect peace, because it confides in thee," v. 3.

6. Metaphor in declaring that in Jehovah there is a rock.

"Trust ye in Jehovah for ever, for in Jah Jehovah is an everlasting rock," v. 4. Unalterable in his nature and purposes, he will prove an unchangeable support to his people through eternal ages.

7. Hypocatastasis in the use of "bring down," which signifies a change from a higher to a lower place, to represent an analogous change of a people from independence and superiority to subordination. "For he bringeth down the inhabitants of the height; the lofty city; he will lay it low; he will lay it low to the ground; he will bring it to the very dust. The foot shall trample on it; the feet of the poor, the steps of the weak," v. 5, 6.

8. Synecdoche, in the use of the height, the lofty city, for high fortified cities generally. This, like all that precedes it, indicates that it is God who is to overthrow the hostile fortresses and cities, and that the destruction of the enemy is to be complete. None that survive will be able or disposed to annoy even the weakest of God's people.

9, 10. Hypocatastases, in the substitution of way, a material path, for the course of action the righteous is to pursue. "The way of the righteous is straight (or level): Thou Most upright wilt level the path of the righteous," v. 7. The duty of the righteous is obvious; trust in God, submission, obedience; faith in the great purposes he has revealed; not self-reliance, misconstructions of his designs; attempts to assume the work of conquering his enemies, which he alone is to accomplish; and he will teach them this great truth by the measures of his providence. The failure of their attempts to save the world, the defeat of their schemes of self-deliverance, and the triumph of their enemies over them, will show them that they have no hope but in God; and prompt them to a submissive and unreserved trust in him.

11. Hypocatastasis in the substitution of waiting in a material path, for the coming—like an approaching host—of God's judgments, for an assured and earnest expectation of the inflictions he has foreshown, by which his enemies are to be destroyed. "Yea, in the way of thy judgments, O Jehovah, have we waited for thee; to thy name and thy remembrance is our soul's desire," v. 8.

12. Metonymy. Name is here put for Jehovah himself, or his perfections of which his name is descriptive. The right-

ing their thoughts to him, and placing their hope of deliverance in him. "Jehovah, in distress they looked to thee, they poured out a prayer, thy chastisement was on them," v. 16.

18. Metaphor, in denominating the utterance, a pouring out of prayer.

19. Comparison of their helplessness and distress in respect to their restoration, to that of a woman in travail. "As when a pregnant woman draws near to the birth, she is in anguish, she cries out in her pangs; so have we been away from thy presence," in our dispersion, "O Jehovah," v. 17. It is in reference to the addition to the nation, already in Palestine, by the return of those who are scattered in foreign lands, that the figure is used.

20, 21, 22. Metaphors. "We have been in travail, we have been in birth-pain; we have as it were brought forth wind," v. 18. No figure could have set forth in a more impressive form the utter fruitlessness and absurdity, even, of *their* attempts to raise the nation to numbers and power by the recall of the scattered tribes. They are to be as unable to achieve that effect, as persons incapable of conception are of bringing forth children. They will not be able even to reconquer Palestine, nor vanquish the nations who, in the beginning of their return, are to assail them there.

23. Hypocatastasis. "We could not give safety to the land, nor would the inhabitants of the world fall," v. 18. The fall of the inhabitants of the world, is put for their being conquered. The Israelites can neither possess themselves securely of their national country, nor vanquish the nations that are, at the crisis to which the prophecy refers, there to attack such of them as will have returned and attempted to reorganize as a people. Their own redemption, their recovery of their ancient inheritance, and the restoration of their lost tribes and families from dispersion, are to be the work of God alone. But he will not only accomplish those events; he will raise the holy dead of the nation also.

24. Apostrophe to the dead. "Thy dead shall live; my (our) dead bodies shall arise; Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust," v. 19. Many commentators suppose that the terms dead and dead bodies are used here by a metaphor, to denote the living Israelites who are then to be in alienation

from God, and that the rising to which they are summoned, is a change from sin to obedience. No mistake could be greater. The fancy is not only wholly inconsistent with the laws of the metaphor; but is forbidden by the apostrophe in which the persons or objects addressed, are always those which the names by which they are designated literally denote. Not an instance can be pointed out in the Scriptures, or any other writing, in which this law of the figure does not hold. "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for Jehovah speaks."—Isa. i. 2. Can any one doubt that it is the real heavens and the earth, that are addressed in this apostrophe? The supposition that they are used representatively of something else, is not only against the principle on which all are conscious they are accustomed to use the figure, but is to render the meaning wholly uncertain. That representative construction of the dead in this passage is confuted, also, by the description of them, which is added, as sleeping in the dust, and as to be cast out of the earth. They are the literally dead, therefore, and "thy dead," God's dead, the dead bodies of his saints; not his enemies. This shows again decisively that the prophecy relates to the time of Christ's second coming, destruction of the antichristian powers, and resurrection of the holy dead. It is confirmed, also, by the reference which follows to God as the source of the influences by which plants are quickened and nourished. "For the dew of plants,"—the moisture by which they are made to germinate and grow,—"is thy dew, and the earth shall cast out the dead," v. 19. The dew by which plants are vivified is declared to be God's, for the purpose of illustrating his power to raise the dead, and it shows decisively that the resurrection contemplated by the prediction is a real corporeal resurrection. For the analogy to which it refers being that between the vivification of plants, the seeds of which die, in order to germination, and the raising of the dead to a new and glorious life, which Paul, also, employs for the same purpose, 1 Cor. xv. 36–38, that which it illustrates is God's power to accomplish the resurrection of the dead with which the other is indirectly compared; not some other event of which no mention is made; and to which the germination of seeds has no analogy.

25. Apostrophe. "Go, my people, enter into thy cham-

bers, and shut thy doors after thee, hide thyself for a little moment, till the wrath be past," v. 20. This, which would appear wholly incongruous, on the supposition that the event that was about to happen was the renovation of the unbelieving Israelites,—is altogether appropriate, if the period which the prediction respects, is that of Christ's coming to take vengeance on his enemies, redeem the living saints from their power, and raise the holy dead to glory. His people are not to attempt to defend themselves by force from their enemies. They are not to take any share in the conflict that is then to rage; but are to withdraw into seclusion, till the storm of Divine wrath has passed; confiding in God alone for their deliverance.

26. Hypocatastasis in the substitution of visiting for inflicting punishment. "For behold, Jehovah is coming out of his place, to visit the iniquity of the inhabitant of the earth upon him, and the earth shall disclose her blood, and shall no more cover her slain," v. 21. That Jehovah is coming out of his place, indicates that he is coming in person and visibly; and that the earth is no longer to cover her blood and her slain, shows that he is to judge and punish those who have drenched her with gore, and peopled her with the bodies of his slaughtered servants; for it is they, especially, whom he is to avenge in the destruction of the antichristian hosts, as is shown in the prediction of the overthrow of great Babylon, because in her was found the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that were slain on the earth; she having fostered the evil passions of their enemies, and instigated and encouraged the persecutions and wars in which they were slain.

The prophecy thus indicates throughout, that the period which it respects, is that of Christ's second coming, resurrection of the holy dead, destruction of the apostate hosts who are then to be assembled in Palestine, and assumption of the sceptre of the earth. These and occurrences that are to be connected with them, are most certainly the events that are foreshown in it. All the attempts of commentators to make it a prediction of a different and inferior set of events, proceed on the grossest violation of the laws of language, and have nothing to support them but wild assumptions and conjectures. It has never yet been fulfilled.

It cannot be till Jehovah comes out of his place, shakes terribly the earth, causes his dead saints to live, and visits their iniquity upon those who slaughter his faithful people, and endeavor to prevent the establishment of his millennial kingdom.

Art. VII.—Hengstenberg on the Song of Solomon.

Das Hohelied Salamonis: ausgelegt von G. W. Hengstenberg, Dr. und Professor der Theologie zu Berlin. Berlin, 1853.

BY THE REV. J. FORSYTH, JUN., D.D.

There is no portion of the Old Testament whose canonical authority rests upon a firmer basis than that of the Song of Solomon, yet we will venture to affirm that there are many Christians who rarely, if ever read it, because they do not pretend to understand it. As Dr. Hengstenberg observes in the Preface of the work above named, the Song has come to be practically excluded from the use of the church. The great mass of the British and American theologians, though entertaining widely different opinions respecting the age, authorship, structure of the Song, and the principles upon which it should be expounded, have very generally united in recognising it as a part of the inspired volume. One of the few dissenters from this view was the late eminent Dr. John Pye Smith, who, in a note in his Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, very peremptorily asserts that "the language of the Song of Solomon is far indeed remote from the deep humility, the reverence and godly fear, which are the inseparable characteristics of the prayers and praises of one, who, though pardoned and favored with all spiritual blessings, can never, and would never forget the lowliness becoming a penitent sinner when admitted to the presence of the Holy One. Further, this book declares no sacred truths, it includes no lessons of faith, obedience, and piety towards God, or of duty to man; it never introduces a devotional sentiment, it makes no mention of Jehovah, his dominion, his

laws, his sanctuary, or his worship; it has no appearance of being a religious poem, didactic, devotional, or prophetic."* The note from which we have made this extract, is, on another account, a great blemish in an otherwise admirable work, for it developes a theory of Inspiration, which virtually robs a considerable portion of the Old Testament of its character as an authoritative standard of faith.

The theologians of Germany, even some of those who are regarded as in the main evangelical, have allowed themselves a good deal of liberty in handling certain parts of the sacred volume, and if we had encountered in one of their works the passage above quoted, we should not have deemed it remarkable; but we do confess that we were greatly surprised, as well as scandalized, to meet with such a bold and absolute denial of the inspiration of a book, whose canonical authority has been recognised by the whole Catholic church, coming from an *evangelical* English dissenting professor of theology. It is one of the many proofs that "evil communications corrupt good manners;" for Dr. Smith was more familiar with the works of the biblical critics of Germany, than any other English theologian of his day. Recently, two distinguished German scholars have published an exposition of the Song of Solomon, one of them being from the pen of Delitzsch, the other of Dr. Hengstenberg. Of the latter, we propose to give a brief account.

The position which Dr. Hengstenberg has long held in the theological world, is of itself sufficient to secure for any production of his pen designed to elucidate the Word of God, a respectful consideration, even if it were got up somewhat hastily; but the present volume contains the deliberate conclusions of its venerable author, the results of many years' study of this particular portion of the Old Testament. So long ago as 1827, he wrote a dissertation in defence of the allegorical method of expounding the Song, and for the express purpose of combating the prevalent sentiment in regard to it, which induced so many Christians virtually to ignore its canonical authority. In the following year, he spent several months in the requisite labor preliminary to

* Script. Test. I. 47.

the composition of a Commentary, but in the progress of his investigations, he encountered difficulties with which he was not prepared at that time satisfactorily to deal. He was hence led to lay aside the subject, though with the fixed resolution to resume it at a future period, when he could avail himself of the fruits of a more extended study and deeper insight into the meaning of the Old Testament. Meanwhile he has prepared and published his Commentaries on the Psalms and the Apocalypse of John, and thus enters upon the task of expounding the Song of Solomon, not only with a ripe judgment and an enlarged experience of the divine life, but also with a familiar acquaintance with those portions of Scripture which present the most numerous and the strongest points of resemblance to the Song of Solomon.

The volume before us contains a new translation of the Song; a commentary upon it, critical and practical, of the same general character as the author's exposition of the Psalms; and lastly, a dissertation, in which the leading questions to which this book has given rise, are ably discussed.

The first of these has reference to the unity of the Song—a point in regard to which biblical critics have been greatly divided. By some, it is maintained that the book has no unity whatever, that it is not even the production of a single author, but consists of a number of pastoral poems composed by various writers, living at different periods, and joined together by a very slender thread. Dr. J. Pye Smith, in the note before quoted, expresses great doubt whether the Song is a single pastoral eclogue, or a collection of poems of this kind. Others, again, regard it as partaking of a dramatic character. Such is the theory of Delitzsch, who asserts that the Song is, in fact, the skeleton of an intended drama. In opposition to these views, Dr. Hengstenberg asserts, that the Song of Solomon is neither a collection of songs by different authors, nor a series of unconnected songs by the same author, but precisely what it purports to be, viz. a single poem having one grand theme, while he at the same time admits that the absence of a regularly developed train of thought gives to the several parts of the Song, a somewhat disjointed appearance. The book divides itself into two portions—the subjects of which are union and reunion; and in neither of these divisions do we find the "dramatic pro-

names Solomon as the author. The genuineness of the inscription or the title, has been called in question, on the ground that, contrary to the uniform usage of the book, the full form of אֲשֶׁר is employed in it; but to this Dr. Hengstenberg replies, that the title is of the nature of prose, and, therefore, that we should not expect to find in it a verbal form which is distinctively poetical.

In the next place, all the historical references and allusions in the Song clearly show that it belongs to the age of Solomon. The address to the spouse, "Come with me from Lebanon," &c., ch. iv. 8, and in vii. 7, vi. 4; the references to Jerusalem, the Temple, the Tower of David, Engedi, Sharon, the valley of the Jordan, Tirzah, Gilead, Heshbon, and Carmel, to say the least, create a very strong presumption that the poem was written before the division of the Hebrew monarchy, and while Jerusalem was the political, as well as the religious, metropolis of the kingdom. Nor is this all. The conviction that the song was written at a time when the localities above named belonged to the dominions of the son of David, "who was king in Jerusalem," will be much strengthened by a consideration of the tone of sentiment which pervades the piece, of its style and manner. While thoroughly natural, it is at once æsthetic and practical, marked by precisely those qualities which we might look for in the production of a poet who lived at the most splendid epoch, the golden age of the Hebrew commonwealth. All the images, the symbols, the pictured scenes of the book, betoken a brilliant period; and the meditative reader cannot help feeling that he is in converse with an author who had shared in the glory, the magnificence, the boundless wealth, the undisturbed repose of those "days without clouds," when the throne of Israel was occupied by David's peaceful son. There are other peculiar features of the Song which point very distinctly to Solomon as its author. It breathes the same lofty spirit which pervades his sublime prayer at the dedication of the Temple, as recorded in 1 Kings viii. The sacred historian informs us that, besides his "three thousand proverbs, and his songs which were a thousand and five," Solomon spake of "trees from the cedar that is in Lebanon unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spake also of beasts, and of

fowls, and of creeping things, and of fishes."—1 Kings iv. 32, 33. In a word, he had a minute and extensive acquaintance with natural history, in its several departments; and as far surpassed all his contemporaries in his familiarity with subjects of scientific research, as he did in the number of his apothegms and of his songs. Now it is exactly this kind of knowledge which the author of the Song perpetually evinces. Still farther, it appears from Ecclesiastes ii., that Solomon cultivated those very arts to which there is such frequent allusion in the Song. He had a taste for horticulture and architecture, and possessing, as he did, almost boundless means for gratifying them, "he made great works, builded houses, planted vineyards, made gardens and orchards, planted trees in them of all kinds of fruit, made pools of water to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees—above all that were in Jerusalem before him." His magnificent edifices and enchanting gardens were, indeed, the wonder of his own age, and in Judea, at least, were never equalled by any of later times. Now the author of the Song not only refers to these magnificent objects with which the Jerusalem of that day and its environs were adorned, but he does it in the tone and manner of one who has the most familiar, every-day acquaintance with these marvellous creations of refined taste and exuberant wealth, —of one, in short, who was their originator and owner.

In the other undoubted productions of Solomon's pen, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, the nature of their subjects, and the species of writing suited to them, and actually employed, differ so widely from the subject and style of the Song, that we should hardly look for any points of affinity between them. Yet such resemblances exist, and we may justly regard them as lending additional strength to the conclusion, that they were all written by the man whose name they in common bear. Thus the book of Proverbs, though, in the main, a collection of condensed, disconnected apothegms, evinces the same fondness for images, continued personification, and allegorical pictures, that appears so prominently in the Song. Then, again, we have a number of expressions which are used both in the Proverbs and the Song. See Prov. i. 9, and Song iv. 9; Prov. i. 28, and Song v. 6; Prov. v. 15–18, and Song iv. 12; Prov. v. 18, 19, and Song

iv. 5; Prov. vi. 30, 31, and Song viii. 7; Prov. ix. 5, and Song vii. 3; Prov. xvi. 24, and Song iv. 11.

Dr. Hengstenberg next proceeds to consider the subject matter of the Song, and its relations to the period in which it was composed. As has been already remarked, the book consists of two leading divisions, the grand themes of which are union and reunion. The first part reaches to the beginning of chapter five, and its principal topics are the following:—1. The grace, the joy, the salvation which shall result from the advent of Messiah. 2. That he bears the name of Solomon, *i. e.* in this book. 3. That before his advent, the people of God shall suffer great and heavy calamities, in consequence of their unfaithfulness; calamities, one chief element of which shall be their subjugation by a Gentile power, and which is variously symbolized by the fierce rays of the sun, the winter, the rain, the darksome night. These calamities of the covenant people shall be rendered more intense, by their own misguided efforts to help themselves, and to obtain the blessings which Messiah alone can confer. 4. With the advent of Messiah, the way is opened for the admission of the Gentiles into the full enjoyment of the rights and immunities of the kingdom of God, and that this is to be accomplished through the instrumentality of the old covenant people, who, in this book, bear the name of the Daughters of Jerusalem.

The remaining portion of the Song, or the second part, treats of—1. The rejection of the heavenly Solomon by the covenant people, and the judgments which, by this act, they bring down upon themselves. 2. Their repentance and the ultimate reunion brought about with the co-operation of the daughters of Jerusalem, with those whom they had, at an earlier day, brought to the knowledge and enjoyment of salvation. 3. The complete restoration of the old relation and bond of love, in consequence of which the daughters of Zion again assume the central position in the kingdom, to be henceforth secured to them by a new covenant, which, unlike the old covenant, never can be broken.

Now, for each of the points included under the first head, an historical basis may be found in the age of Solomon. 1. That there was a lively faith in the existence of a personal Messiah, and a confident expectation of his advent, is abun-

dantly proved by the Messianic Psalms; particularly by the ii. and cx. by David, the lxxii. by Solomon, and the xlv. by the sons of Korah, and which, most probably, belongs to the same period. Of this faith and hope, the "point of departure" may be said to be the prophecy of Jacob, "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet until Shiloh come." This prediction, combined with the subsequent prophetic announcement, 2 Sam. vii., of the perpetuity of the dominion of the race of David, supplied a solid objective basis to the subjective Psalm poetry of the Hebrews. 2. The name of Solomon agrees with the contents and tenor of the lxxii. Psalm, from which it is manifest that the reign of Solomon was a type and image of the righteous and peaceful rule of Messiah. That there is no impropriety in the transfer of the name to Christ, and in regarding him as the heavenly Solomon, will appear, if we look at the circumstances under which David's immediate successor and son obtained the name. "Behold," said the prophet Nathan to David, "a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a *man* of *rest*, and I will give him rest from all his enemies round about, for his name shall be Solomon, and I will give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days. He shall build an house for my name, and he shall be my son, and I will be his father."—1 Chron. xxii. 9, 10. We think that there can be no doubt that David recognised the typical relation between his son Solomon and the promised Shiloh, and clearly foresaw that the firmly established and peaceful sway of Solomon over the whole land of promise would shadow forth the wider and more glorious dominion of Him to whom all the kings of the earth should do homage, and whom all nations should obey. Indeed the analogy between the two names Solomon and Shiloh, both in form and meaning, not indistinctly intimates a typical relation between the persons bearing them; and, if the least doubt remained on this head, the lxxii. Psalm would surely remove it. No one can read that magnificent hymn without feeling that "a greater than Solomon is here," yet one of whom the earthly Solomon, the "man of rest" and peace, was a striking type. 3. That the advent of Messiah would be preceded by a period of great and sore calamities, was a fact, of which David and Solo-

mon were not ignorant. So it had been in the whole past history of Israel; each remarkable epoch of national prosperity was preceded by a season of trouble. The bondage in Egypt was the immediate antecedent of the covenant made at Sinai; the wanderings of the desert preceded the entrance into the promised land under Joshua; the low estate of the nation under the judges, the misrule, the almost anarchy of that time, introduced the splendid age of David and Solomon. In many of the Psalms, and particularly in that remarkable series which may be called the Davidic cyclus, cxxxviii.–cxlv., it is very plain that David was thoroughly aware of the deep humiliation which awaited his race and the covenant people of God, of the deep waters of affliction through which they would have to pass before the arrival of the promised days of rest and peace. We can hardly imagine that this series of "Psalms of David" was arranged as it is without a purpose. It closes with a song of thanks, the cxlv., for the re-erection of the tabernacle of David, which had been so long thrown down, and for the restoration of his throne to far more than its ancient glory. 4. The knowledge of the fact that the Gentiles were to be incorporated with the kingdom of Messiah, was almost as old as the hope that Messiah should appear. "In thy seed," ran the promise to Abraham, "shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;" while the prediction of Jacob respecting the Shiloh intimated, "that to Him should the gathering of the nations be." We might quote many passages from the Psalms of David to prove that he anticipated and rejoiced in the extension to the Gentiles of those glorious privileges and blessings which were in his day, and would continue to be the peculiar inheritance of Israel. Solomon not only recognises the same truth in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple, but in the lxxii. Psalm he contemplates with a holy exultation the universal spread of Messiah's dominion, and hails with transports of joy the coming of the day when "all nations shall be blessed in him, and all nations shall call him Blessed." Indeed, we greatly mistake, if we suppose that the narrow prejudices prevalent among the Jews at the time of our Lord's advent, and their bitter hatred of Gentiles, as such, existed in the earlier ages of the Jewish church. There is not the slightest

evidence to show that the popular mind needed to be prepared for the reception of the idea of the Gentiles being admitted into the commonwealth of Israel.

With reference to the *second* part of the Song, it may be observed that the subjects embraced in it are not so clearly brought out in the Messianic prophecies, given prior to the days of Solomon, as are those of the first. Up to that time there had been no very distinct intimation that, by a large portion of the Jewish people, the promised Messiah would be rejected, and the salvation preached in his name despised, and that for this great national sin, Israel should suffer a terrible punishment. Still we may properly regard this crowning instance of Jewish obstinacy and unbelief, though not named in express terms, as implied in that awful prophetic description of the judgments awaiting his people in a distant age, which were uttered by Moses when near the close of his public ministry, and which we find recorded in the book of Deuteronomy. Paul, in Rom. x. 19, declares, that those words of Moses, in Deut. xxxii. 21, "I will provoke you to anger by them which are not a people," &c., were intended to announce the casting away of the Jews, and the reception of the Gentiles in their room. Many of the Psalms impressively teach that "they are not all Israel who are of Israel;" particularly those in which the promised salvation is limited to the righteous, while the wicked are in effect excommunicated, and their final ruin foretold; see Psalms l., lxxviii., xcv., xcix., cxxv. The teachings of the Song, on this head, are therefore only the application of a general truth to a particular relation, and such use of it exactly agrees with the declarations of prophecy on this very point, in the times subsequent to Solomon's. On the only remaining topic of this division, viz. the principle enunciated by St. Paul, that "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance," it will not be necessary to dwell. "God hath not cast off his people which he foreknew," says the apostle. Long as may be the period of their exclusion from the privileges once enjoyed by them, it is not to be perpetual. For many a century, Jerusalem, the ancient seat of their solemnities, the sacred spot where their fathers worshipped, where the ashes of their monarchs, and prophets, and holy men repose, shall be trod down of the Gentiles,

but David and Solomon well knew that these dismal years should have an end, that breaches and desolations of many generations should be repaired, that Zion should be built up, and invested with far more than her ancient splendor, for then should her Lord appear in his glory. It was a part of the true Hebrew's faith and hope long before the days of these great kings, for Moses, who had predicted that the glory of Israel would be sadly dimmed, had also foretold that it should at length shine forth with a transcendent lustre.

The only remaining question that claims to be considered, has reference to the interpretation of the Song. On what principle is this book to be expounded? Are we to understand its language in its strictly literal, or in an allegorical sense.

Dr. Hengstenberg gives a very decided answer to this question, and affirms that the very title of the book—the Song of Songs—proves that the author of it meant it to be understood in an allegorical sense. On any other supposition, the inscription of the poem, if not a lampoon, would at least cast great dishonor upon all the other Scriptures of the Old Testament. What right-hearted Israelite would have ventured to pronounce a song founded upon earthly relations, and descriptive of a merely earthly love, superior to the many divine Psalms and Songs of a Moses, a Miriam, a Deborah, a Hannah, a David? Its title, the Song of Songs, only can be justified, and is most befitting, if we regard the subject of it to be Him who is "fairer than the children of men, into whose lips grace is poured," the most glorious of all objects, the loftiest of all themes. Even the name, Solomon, in the title, admits of an allegorical exposition, for certain it is that the royal preacher and poet never could have said of himself what is said respecting the Solomon of the Song.

The position that the allegorical interpretation is the true one, derives much strength from a comparison of the Song with the xlv. Psalm. Both exhibit essentially the same features, they employ the same imagery, they treat of the same subject; and if one partakes of the nature of allegory, so must the other. The Psalm is, in truth, the Song in a very condensed form, a brief compend of it, prepared, doubt-

less, for the purpose of being used in the worship of the temple, by the sons of Korah, who, in this instance, bore to Solomon the same relation as Psalms xlii., xliii., lxxxvi., represent them as sustaining to his father David. The points of similarity between these two compositions are numerous, and at the same time so obvious, that it is quite needless to dwell upon them in detail. Both exhibit the king in precisely the same light, as "fairer than the children of men"—as "the chief among ten thousand;" both exhibit the bride not as a single individual, but as composed of a multitude of persons, one of whom, however, is raised to a position of especial dignity; both exhibit in the same pictorial manner the heroic valor, and august majesty of the king; both represent the kings of the earth as his allies; both speak of "myrrh and aloes," the latter term being found nowhere else than in these two places; the palace of ivory of the Psalm answers to the tower of ivory of the Song; and in both there is substantially the same exhortation to the bride to forget her own people, and her father's house. To these points of resemblance between the Psalm and the Song, may be added the numerous verbal allusions to the latter, in the Prophets, *e. g.* Song i. 4, and Hos. xi. 4; ii. 3, and Hos. xiv. 6, 8, 9; iii. 6, and Joel iii. 3; ii. 14, and Ob. 3; i. 16, and Is. xxxiii. 17; ii. 1, and Is. xxxv. 1, besides many more.

In the second place, the allegorical interpretation of the Song rests upon the highest of all authority, that of our Lord and his apostles. The New Testament abounds throughout with references, more or less distinct, to the Song of Solomon; and one cannot but wonder at the superficiality or the ignorance of those who assert that in the New Testament this book is nowhere recognised. Our Lord refers to it, and in such a way as to show that it is to be understood in an allegorical sense, in Matth. vi. 28–30—compare Song ii. 1; Matth. xiii. 25, xxiv. 22, comp. Song v. 2; Matth. xxi. 33, comp. Song viii. 11; Luke xii. 35–37, comp. Song v. 3; John vii. 44, comp. Song i. 4; John vii. 33, 34, comp. Song v. 6, and in other places, which it is needless to quote.

In the third place, this method of interpretation is supported by the consensus of the Jewish synagogue. That

exposition which can claim to be regarded as the national one, which has been everywhere, and at all times, received by the most learned Jews, is certainly entitled to very great respect, and this unquestionably is the allegorical. Josephus, in his enumeration of the canonical books of the Old Testament, ranks the Song among the prophetical, and that such is its proper place and character is expressly asserted by the Targum. The author of the fourth book of Ezra, who probably lived B. C. 25, has this language: "Of all the flowers of the earth thou hast chosen the lily alone; of all the cities of the world thou hast sanctified for thyself only Zion; of the whole feathered creation thou hast chosen for thyself the dove alone;" *i. e.* Zion is the lily, the dove, the bride of the Song. Rabbi-Akîba says, "The whole world is not of so great value as the single day on which the Song of Songs was given to Israel. All the books of Scripture are indeed sacred, but the Song of Songs is the most sacred. And if there be any dispute respecting the books of Solomon, it is only about Ecclesiastes." Aben Ezra says, "Away, away with the idea that the Song of Songs treats of carnal pleasure; all its words are spoken figuratively. Unless it possessed the very highest dignity and worth, it could never have obtained a place among the books of Holy Scripture. Nor has there ever been any controversy among us respecting it."

The history of the exegesis of this book brings out a fact which is not fitted to beget much favor for the literal method, viz. that all the older advocates of it were men whose orthodoxy was of a very suspicious kind—Theodore of Mopsuestia, Castellio, Grotius, Simon Episcopius. On the other hand, the Christian church of all ages, and especially in her purest and best times, has not only rejected this method, but has regarded it with horror. In view of considerations such as those already presented, we are warranted in saying that, before we leave in this matter, "the footsteps of the flock," and yield to those who insist that the book is to be taken in a strictly literal sense, the reasons for such a course must be so decisive as virtually to compel us to adopt it.

Now the grand argument on which the advocates of this theory depend, is this,—the allegorical representation of Israel, under the figure of a spouse, was never used by th

of the church. Now the considerate critic, in dealing with the fact that previous to the Song this representation occurs rarely, and as it were in germ only, while after the Song it is met with often and fully developed, would argue, 1. That the Song must have been composed by Solomon. 2. That it was never understood in any other than an allegorical sense. Then this result would be strongly confirmed by the circumstance, that in precise accordance with the chain-like character of Scripture, we meet this same representation in those books which stand nearest to the Song in point of age.

We do not enter into any criticism of the commentary which fills the largest portion of the volume. Its character may be inferred from the views which Dr. Hengstenberg holds of the subject matter and structure of the Song, as well as from his other exegetical works. Though we do not imagine that our readers will concur with him in all points, we look upon the work as a most valuable contribution to the exegetical literature of the Old Testament. The avowed aim of the volume, is to restore this most precious gift of the Spirit of inspiration—the Song of Songs—to the place in the practical judgment and affection of the church, to which it is so pre-eminently entitled.

Art. VIII.—The Fall of the Turkish Empire.

That the Turkish power, though still to prolong its existence for a period, is hastening to its fall, has become the general conviction of statesmen and politicians, as well as the students of the sacred word who are guided in their views by the revelations that are there made of the future. That event, whenever and however it takes place, will be one of no ordinary significance. The extinction of a race that has been so vast in its numbers, so stern in its character, so hostile to God and his people, so cruel and bloody towards its subjects, that has reigned for so long a period over so large and fine a portion of the globe,—the birthplace of the arts, the seat of all the first great empires, the scene in which Christianity had its origin and its first triumphs; and that as heaven's

of the first century, to statesmen and philosophers, would doubtless have seemed altogether improbable. The Roman empire had then scarcely begun to decline from its power. Its territory extended from Britain in the west, to beyond the Euphrates in the east, and from the Rhine, the Danube, and the Euxine in the north, to the mountains and deserts of Africa that skirt the Mediterranean and the Nile. No power was then known that seemed likely ever to conquer it. That innumerable hosts from the wastes of Tartary should sweep over its eastern half, like a resistless deluge, and hold it in subjection through a long tract of ages, was to mere human foresight as improbable, as that its fall should result from such incursions from the wilds of Africa.

Yet the prediction has met the most conspicuous verification. Every stroke of the prophetic pencil delineates some feature or color of the event that stands out in bold relief in the fulfilment. And this has resulted in a large degree from two peculiarities that have distinguished the policy of the Turks, from that of the other nations generally. 1. They prohibited, or at least discountenanced intermarriages with the conquered, and, thereby, instead of fusing the different races into one people, like the Jews preserved themselves as a distinct species, and by that means kept themselves in an attitude to fulfil their office as slaughterers and torturers of those whom they had conquered; and held them in a condition by which they were continued the objects of their remorseless passions. The result was, that the Turks who were born and nurtured in the conquered territory, remained as distinct from the vanquished races with whom they were intermixed, as the first invading hosts were; and the Persians, Syrians, Armenians, Georgians, Greeks, and Sclavonians have continued as clearly defined from the Turks, Arabs, and each other, very nearly as though they had existed as separate nations and under governments of their own. This is a remarkable peculiarity. The Goths and Vandals that conquered the western empire, instead of perpetuating themselves as distinct races, immediately mixed like confluent streams with the populations whom they conquered, and each great division formed by the fusion a new people distinguished from all others by physiognomy, language, and manners, as the Italians, the French, the Spaniards, the

Germans. Had the Turks pursued this course, the verification of the prediction would have been impossible. It was only by preserving their respective nationalities, that the conquerors continued themselves in a condition to fill their office of torturers towards the races over whom they domineered; and that these races were continued in a condition to be the victims of their power. Who could have foreseen such a policy, or deemed it probable it could be inflexibly adhered to throughout their long career of eight centuries?

2. The other peculiarity of their procedure is equally remarkable. While they prohibited the abandonment of the religion of Mahomet, by any of their own race, and punished it with death, they freely allowed, in the main, the Christian nations whom they conquered, to continue the profession and practice of theirs. The churches, accordingly, of the Greek, the Catholic, the Syrian, the Armenian, and the Coptic communions, still continued to exist, preserved their organizations as hierarchies, and were tolerated and protected in offering their worship, and in enforcing their discipline; and by that means were continued in a position in which they could be punished as apostates. This element of the Turkish policy presents a striking contrast to that pursued both by the nations whom they vanquished, and by the Gothic tribes who conquered the western empire. The monarchs of the eastern Roman empire had struggled, with but here and there a brief intermission, through the ten centuries that elapsed from Nero to the first incursion of the Turks, to force the whole of their subjects to observe the religion of the state; the pagan emperors endeavoring to drive back the followers of Christ into the temples of idolatry; and those who assumed the Christian name from Constantine to the last of the line, laboring first to exterminate paganism, and after the overthrow of idolatry, to compel the whole of the Christian body to profess the creed and observe the rites that received the sanction of the court; while in the west, a war of extermination was waged by the state and the church against dissentients from the legalized faith, especially from the eleventh century, when Hildebrand rose to the headship of the papacy, to the eighteenth; and vast hosts of them were from generation to generation consigned to the sword, the rack, and the stake. Those were

the ages of the unobstructed domination of the church of Rome, of the bloody crusades against the Albigenses of the south of France and the Waldenses of Piedmont, of the wars of the Catholic princes of Germany, France, Spain, and Great Britain against their Protestant subjects, and of the dungeons, the wheels, and the fires of the Inquisition. For centuries there was not a spot within the circuit of Christendom, except in the dominions of the Turks, in which a company of Christians could openly profess a creed and offer a worship, that differed from that of the state, but at the hazard of their lives. Nor was dissent from their respective creeds allowed even at that time by the patriarchs of the eastern churches; but while tolerated by the Turks in the profession of their own faith, they continued to domineer over the members of their communions, as arbitrarily as their contemporaries at the west, and to crush, as far as in their power, with the iron hand of discipline, all who ventured to revolt from their authority, or dissent from their faith. It was by the toleration, accordingly, they were allowed by the Turks, that those churches perpetuated themselves, and in such isolation from the Mahometans by whom they were surrounded, that they could continue through the whole period of their vassalage, to be as distinctly the object of their torturing inflictions, as in the first age of their subjugation. Had the Sultans pursued the remorseless course of the rulers of the west, treated the profession of Christianity as an inexpiable crime, and either forced their Christian subjects to adopt the Mahometan faith, or consigned them to the sword, they would long since have swept the churches in their dominions from existence. By this peculiar policy, however, they have continued to exist in the relations to each other, which were contemplated by the prophecy, and necessary to its fulfilment.

The first great division of the invading Turks was that which entered the empire under Togrul Beg in A.D. 1050, who, spreading the myriads of his cavalry over the frontier from Taurus to Erzeroum, a space of six hundred miles, consigned a hundred and thirty thousand Christians to slaughter. He was followed, at a distance of thirteen years, by his successor, Alp Arslan, who crossed the Euphrates at the head of another cavalry army, and in a war of ten or

twelve years, conquered Georgia and Armenia, and overrunning Phrygia and Anatolia, strewed them with slaughter and devastation; and bore off their spoils to the banks of the Oxus. On the division of the Seljukian empire twenty years later, three of the Sultanries, Persia, Syria, and Roum, lay within the bounds of Christendom, and the prince to whom Roum was assigned—extending from the Euphrates to the Bosphorus, and from the Euxine to the Mediterranean—immediately invaded it with a fresh army of cavalry, and establishing his camp in Phrygia, spread his flying squadrons in every direction, and wasting the country with slaughter and pillage, soon reduced it to subjection, and transmitted it to his heirs for a hundred and fifty years. In the meantime, Syria was repeatedly overrun by fresh armies, and Jerusalem conquered, and, for a time, made the seat of the Sultanry; the Mussulmans themselves were embroiled in violent contests with each other, and the country ravaged and drenched with the blood of its inhabitants.

The second great division of the Tartar host, was that of the Moguls, who, about the middle of the thirteenth century, after conquering Persia, crossed the Euphrates, and subdued Armenia, Iconium, and Anatolia, and put an end to the Seljukian dynasty; while another division, advancing to the west, passed the great rivers that enter the Caspian and Euxine, and after overrunning Russia and Poland, wasted the country on both sides of the Danube, Hungary, Servia, Bosnia, and Bulgaria, and spread them with the ruins of their cities, and the bones of their inhabitants.

The third army was that of the Ottomans, who crossed the Euphrates about the middle of the thirteenth century, and separating from other hordes that invaded Syria and the south-eastern parts of Asia Minor, established themselves on the Sangar, and in 1299 commenced a war of devastation and conquest, which terminated, at the end of forty years in the subjugation of the whole of the Greek territory to the Hellespont and Bosphorus. The Turks soon after passed into Europe, and wrested Thrace and Macedonia from the hands of the Greeks, and ere the close of the century, extended their incursions beyond the Balkan mountains; conquered Bulgaria and Servia, and crossing the Danube waged war with the Moldavians and Hungarians,

and in a single battle slaughtered or drove into the river the greater part of their army of a hundred thousand. To these conquests at the west, they added equal territories in the east, and extended their empire throughout the whole of Asia Minor to the Euphrates.

The fourth army was that of the Moguls, under Tamerlane, who, after conquering Persia, near the close of the fourteenth century, in the beginning of the fifteenth, waged a bloody crusade against the Christians of Georgia, and from their subjugation, passed into Syria, captured Aleppo and Damascus, and gave their inhabitants to promiscuous slaughter. What havoc he made of life, is seen from the fact that he gathered 90,000 heads of his victims, and erected them into a pyramid, on his return, on the ruins of Bagdad. Soon after, collecting an army of 800,000, he marched into Asia Minor, and conquering and capturing the Ottoman Sultan Bajazet, spread his squadrons over the whole empire, and wrenched from its population, Mussulman as well as Christian, a vast amount of spoils. On the retreat of Tamerlane, the line of Bajazet resumed the sceptre, and soon turned their arms against Constantinople, and at length, in 1453, captured it, and extinguished the empire of the Greeks.

Thus, through the long round of four hundred years, a continued series of cavalry armies, of immense numbers, poured down like a deluge from the wilds of Tartary upon the empire, and strewed it with desolation. The sole business of those innumerable hordes was war, slaughter, outrage, pillage, and destruction. Not a city of any note, from the confines of Persia, in the east, to the Danube, in the west, but was captured, sacked, and drenched with the blood of its inhabitants. Vast numbers of them, reduced to utter ruin, have never been rebuilt; but their broken walls and fallen columns remain to the present day, monuments at once of the wealth, culture, and power of their ancient inhabitants, and of the ruthless barbarity of their destroyers.

Those evils, however, which were thus brought on the population of the eastern empire by the Turks, were very far from the whole of which they were the occasion to Christendom during that period. A fanatical desire to recover the sacred places of Palestine from their power, brought the whole of the western nations also, in a measure, within the

sweep of their scourge, and consigned vast crowds of them to destruction by the sword, by famine, and by pestilence. Of the first body of the crusaders, who set out on their march in 1096, 300,000 of the vanguard perished ere they had reached the Bosphorus; and of the 700,000 who passed into Asia, nearly the whole sank under the fatigues and exposures of their march, perished from hunger and disease, or fell in battles and sieges, ere they conquered Jerusalem; and they proved as terrible a scourge to the nations whose territory they traversed, as the most ruthless Turkish conquerors. The Christian population at their approach fled to the forests and mountains for safety. They everywhere marked their track by blood, pillage, and devastation, and left large districts of the country behind them a dreary solitude, a vast waste of ruins.

Of the army of the second crusade, in 1147, and the third in 1189, amounting together to 600,000, and an innumerable host of pilgrims of both sexes, that accompanied them, nearly the whole perished, in like manner, in their passage through Asia Minor, by the treachery of the Greeks, the sword of the Turks, and the still fiercer assaults of pestilence and famine. Of the 60,000 cavalry of the third expedition, scarce a thousand remained on their reaching Iconium. Nearly equal disasters befel those of their coadjutors, also, from Italy, France, Germany, and Britain, who proceeded to Palestine by sea. Struck down in a long series of battles, exhausted by the heats of the climate, and wasted by famine, only a very small number out of five or six hundred thousand, survived to return to their native shores.

The fourth crusade was directed against the Greeks themselves, instead of the Turks, and issued in the capture and pillage of Constantinople, and the conquest and possession of the empire by the Venetians and Franks, for near sixty years. The fifth of 200,000 troops, and the sixth of 150,000, directed by the princes of France against Egypt, soon terminated in the most fatal and ignominious disasters; and the seventh and last, of 36,000, which invaded Tunis, met a similar fate.

Thus, by these preposterous undertakings the western nations were made to participate in the Turkish woe, which they would otherwise have escaped, several millions of them

were consigned to an untimely and horrible death, their treasures in immense amounts were transferred to the hands of their destroyers, and a vast train of evils—poverty, wretchedness, demoralization—devolved on their families at home.

During the two hundred and fifty years that followed the fall of Constantinople, the Turkish princes endeavored in frequent wars to extend their conquests still further to the west; Servia, Bosnia, Hungary, and Bohemia, were converted into a vast battle ground throughout that long period, and steeped with the blood of conflicting hosts, and strewn with devastation; the Turks extended their territory to the confines of Austria; Germany and Italy were kept in incessant apprehension of further conquests; and it was not until the battle of Zenta, in 1697, that their career of victory was arrested. In the meantime, they continued to be a scorpion scourge to the churches under their dominion in the east, as well as the west, as they are to the present time, crushing them with relentless oppression, wrenching thousands and myriads of the young of each successive generation, of both sexes, from the arms of their parents and delivering them to the most debasing slavery, consigning crowds from time to time to outrage and slaughter, and trampling them down to the lowest depths of degradation and misery. To the vast multitudes who have peopled those spacious regions during the eight hundred years of their wars and domination, amounting probably to six or seven hundred millions, freedom, peace, and safety, have been unknown. Not an individual of that immense series, but has been made to taste the cup of woe, while most have been compelled to drink it to the dregs. Could all the terrors of that scene be gathered into one group, the countless slaughters on the battle field and in the sack of cities, the wholesale massacres of the unarmed and defenceless, the brutal outrages of the helpless of every age and condition, the storm and demolition of towns, the conflagration of dwellings, the devastation of fields, and all the complicated miseries of poverty, hunger, disease, tyranny, and despair, that followed in their train, no eye could support the spectacle; no heart could sustain the infinite sum of horrors.

They have thus slaughtered and tortured on a scale that

answers to the terrible indications of the prophecy. The prediction has been equally fulfilled, that the rest who were not killed by them, should not repent of their false worships, nor reform their evil manners. They have continued in their apostasy to saint homage, their addiction to superstitious rites, and their debasement of manners, without amendment, to the present day. Their religion has been, and is, little else than a dead formality. Scarce a pulse of life has been exhibited by them for a dozen generations.

The evils thus inflicted on those nations, form an impressive manifestation of God's displeasure at their sins, and the certainty that he will execute the threatenings of his word on those who apostatize from his service; and their incorrigibility under his chastenings, shows with anawful emphasis the inefficacy of rebukes and suffering, to recall false churches from idolatry, superstition, and profligacy, to a true knowledge and pure worship of God, and that he is justified in consigning them to destruction.

This colossal power, however, that has so long trampled down so large a portion of the race, though not immediately to be overthrown, is rapidly hastening to its catastrophe, and its fall will be an event of unusual interest. No other people has ever filled such a terrific office, through so long a period. No other is ever to follow it as a scourge of the nations. Its dissolution is to form an epoch in the history of the world. It is to be the harbinger of the overthrow also of the antichrist of the west, and the deliverance of the earth through the long round of the millennial reign, alike from the fatal sway of false religions, and the bloody rule of human tyrants. Who can contemplate the dreadful work, which as God's avenger it has performed, without awe! Who can look forward to its approaching end, but with exhilaration and joy!

Art. IX.—Literary and Critical Notices.

1. The British Periodicals. Republished by Leonard Scott & Co.

The Westminster for October contains several articles of more than ordinary interest in a religious relation. The first, entitled Religion

in Italy, is devoted to the proof of the fact, which is now confirmed by testimonies from every quarter, that faith in the Roman Catholic religion is rapidly expiring in Italy, and that a desire and determination already pervade all classes, to free themselves from the domination of the priests, and obtain religious as well as political freedom. As this great change, which has suddenly emerged into conspicuity, corroborates the construction we have placed on the sixth vial, and is, ere long, there is reason to believe, to display itself in more open forms, and lead to direct assaults on the hierarchy, it merits the special attention of the people of God. The writer says:

"In order to obtain a correct insight into the real tendencies and opinions of the Italian people, with respect to the dominant religion of the Peninsula, we must penetrate beneath the surface; for upon a superficial examination of the political movements of the last few years, when the Italians appeared to hold their destinies in their own hands, and yet instead of destroying their ancient idols, bent their knee before them, imploring their redemption of the papacy,—one might feel disposed to doubt whether they were not condemned for a long time yet to lie bound in the shackles of theocracy, yet nothing can be farther from the truth. *Italy has thrown off the leading-strings of papacy, and come forth from her thraldom.* Even while she lately professed herself Catholic, she in fact but made the Pope a symbol of political aims and ideas, with which the church and court of Rome had nothing in common."

And in confirmation of it, he quotes the following passage from Franchi, a recent Italian writer:

"What the sentiments are that Italy cherishes for the doctrines and practices of the Catholic religion, the history of the last four years especially has made so evident, as to admit of no further doubt or illusion. If we look to the clergy, their language is become a continued lament, a doleful elegy on the wickedness of the times, on the perversity of ideas, on the invasion of incredulity, on the misfortunes and wounds of the church. From the encyclica of the Pope to the sermon of the curate, from the pastoral of the bishop to the preaching of the missionaries, from the conferences of the sacristy to articles in newspapers, the voice of the clergy is raised, only to deplore the misfortunes of Italy, *because the Catholic faith is diminishing, and iniquity is becoming universal;* and they have reason—*daily and solemn facts justify their lamentations. Wherever the free expression of thought or conscience has existed, or yet exists, there open war is breathed against the Pope, the bishops, the rites, the mysteries;* in short, *against Catholicism;* there, in books and pamphlets, in meetings and societies, in market-places and theatres, *are loudly pro-*

claimed the principles of a rational faith [that is, an unbelieving philosophy], *which are the complete negation of the orthodox* [Romish] *faith.* And where the voice of public opinion is suppressed, where the press is silent, men speak in their *acts;* and these, with an eloquence only more energetic in its minuteness, *testify that the Italian people is no longer Catholic, save in name;* and that if many, as individuals, still remain faithful to the Pope, it can no longer be said that *the nation,* as a body, *is subject to him.*"

A large share of the upper classes have undoubtedly long been unbelievers, not only of Catholicism, but of Christianity itself, as they have in France and Germany, and scepticism and aversion have gradually been spread among the people generally, by the vices and tyrannies of the clergy; but the alienation has lately been rapidly developed, and raised to a passion, by the disappointment of the enthusiastic hopes of a more liberal administration, that were excited on the accession of the present Pope to the see. A considerable party then believed that a reformation, both of the state and the church, was practicable without their subversion, and persuaded themselves that it was to be achieved by Pius the Ninth; but his speedy retraction of the promises he had given of a constitutional and representative government, his desertion of his throne, his denunciation of the republic, which was instituted in its place, and finally, the overthrow of that government, at his instance, by a foreign force, and the extinction throughout the whole of Italy, where his influence predominates, of the last trace of political and religious freedom, has convinced them that no amelioration of their condition is to be expected from that quarter; has led them to regard the Pope and the hierarchy as their worst enemies; and has inspired them with a determination, at the earliest moment that it is practicable, to strike them from existence, as an indispensable step to their deliverance. After depicting the revulsion produced by these retrograde movements, the writer concludes by declaring "that Italy is no longer Catholic in her belief—that if there are still many that continue so in name, it is chiefly from an external necessity, and among the poorer and uneducated classes." That this is true, on a great scale, there is no reason to doubt; though the hostility to the priests and the hierarchical government is much more general, we think, than the entire disbelief of Catholicism.

Though the picture the reviewer presents of the alienation of the people of Italy from the papacy is correct, the faith which he proposes as a substitute for Catholicism—a vague and dreamy deism—is as false as absurd, and would prove as fatal to their virtue, freedom, and happiness, as the superstition by which they have been reduced

to their present debasement and vassalage. The evils generated by a corrupt church are not to be cured by a lawless and ferocious infidelity. The Catholic hierarchies, indeed, are not to be reformed, or quietly superseded by other organizations. Instead, they are ripening for the vintage, and are soon to be swept from the scenes they are polluting, by the sword of avenging justice.

Though less adapted to interest readers generally, the seventh article, entitled the Universal Postulate, is far the most important of the number, as it is devoted, and successfully, to the criticism and confutation of the metaphysical theories of Kant, Schelling, and Hegel, which are the basis of the atheistic and pantheistic infidelity that now reigns in Germany, and is spreading with a portentous rapidity in Great Britain and this country. Though in the main drawn probably from the disquisitions of Sir William Hamilton on that subject, it displays powers of a very high order, and lays for ever in the dust the towering fabrics of idealism, which Hume, Berkeley, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Coleridge, Hegel, and their coadjutors, have employed themselves in erecting. After a disquisition, perhaps too long and intricate, on the criteria of our knowledge, in which he attempts to push his analysis, we think, too far, and is more subtle than accurate, he at length announces the doctrine, maintained by Sir William Hamilton, though expressed, in a measure, in different terms, that our necessary and universal beliefs, or in other words, our consciousnesses, are the ultimate and infallible criteria of our knowledge; that is, that whatever we are conscious takes place within us, and whatever we are conscious we see and feel without us, and by the law of our nature regard as really existing, must be taken as real; such as our being, the operations of our minds, and the external objects we perceive by our senses; that our consciousness is of equal authority, whatever part of our nature it respects; and therefore that the testimony of our senses to the existence of the external world is as absolute and indisputable, as the testimony of our reason is to the reality of the truths which we perceive by that faculty. But that subverts at a stroke the system of idealism, whatever the form is which it assumes, by sweeping away its foundation; as it is built on a denial of the veracity of that part of our consciousness which respects our sense-perceptions, and represents it as the mere product of our own nature, or the act of God, independently of any external objects answering to those which we see and feel, and as therefore altogether illusory. For that, in the first place, is contrary to fact, and unphilosophical; and next, if true, it subverts idealism as absolutely as realism, inasmuch as to convict that part of our consciousness of falsehood, is equally to impeach the veracity of that also

ceive a sound greater or lesser in proportion to the air's motion; but without some motion in the air we never have any sound.'

"If now we demur to the many obvious assumptions of realism which this reasoning involves, and insist on Berkeley's restating it without taking for granted any thing save the existence of mind and ideas, he cannot do so. Let the words that stand for objective realities be supposed to stand for our ideas of them, and the argument becomes meaningless. If it be said that these objective realities are but hypothetically assumed for the purpose of meeting an opponent, it is replied that this cannot be; for Berkeley's reasonings are, in truth, his justification of idealism to his own mind; and if he could justify idealism to his own mind, without making these assumptions, he could show us the way."

Hume's scepticism, in like manner, confutes itself by assuming the realities which it denies.

"Hume makes more assumptions even than Berkeley does. He sets out by saying that our perceptions resolve themselves into *impressions and ideas*, and on this division all his reasoning hinges. Obviously did he merely postulate these two things, the foundation of his argument would be less certain than the undecomposable belief he calls in question. But he artfully postulates more than two things without seeming to do so. For what is contained in the concept,—an impression? Translate the word into thought, and there are manifestly involved a thing impressing and a thing impressed. It is impossible to attach any idea to the word save by the help of these other ideas. Without contending at length, as we might, that our conception of things impressing and things impressed are gained by seeing bodies act upon each other, and that we cannot realize these conceptions without assuming the objectivity of such bodies—without dwelling upon the illegitimacy of an argument which assumes that there are impressions, and then goes on to show that there are neither things impressing nor things impressed, and which thus, taking the *abstract* for its fulcrum, proposes to overset the *concrete* from which it is abstracted,—without dwelling upon this, it suffices our present purpose to remark, that unless Hume postulates the three things—the impression, the impressing, and the impressed, his reasoning is meaningless from the very beginning."

On the other hand, the theory of Kant, which he devised to escape the scepticism of Hume, confutes itself by contradicting and impeaching the veracity of our consciousness, on the truth of which he, nevertheless, founds the metaphysical reasoning which he employs to sustain his system. If the testimony of our consciousness respecting the externality of space, and the objects of our sense-per-

ceptions which exist in it, is without authority, and wholly deceptive; the testimony of that part of our consciousness which respects the reality and truth of our supersensual ideas, must be equally without authority. To assume the infallible truth of the latter, and use it to demonstrate the untrustworthiness of the former, is unphilosophical, weak, and self-confuting in the utmost degree. Yet it is on that self-destructive basis that Kant erects his system:

"It is curious to see a doctrine which positively contradicts our primary inferences, chosen as a refuge from another doctrine which *doubts* them. In the philosophy of Kant, however, this is done. *Scepticism* merely *questions* all things, and professes decisively to affirm nothing. *Kantism*, in anxiety to escape it, decisively *affirms* things *contrary to universal belief* [that is universal consciousness]. That space and time are 'forms of sensibility,' or 'subjective conditions of thought,' that have no objective basis, is as repugnant to common sense, as any proposition that can be framed. And to adopt this proposition, instead of the one that we have no sufficient evidence of any objective existence, seems to be a preference of the greater evil to the less. . . . .

"The fact on which Kant bases his assertion that space is a *subjective* form, and not an *objective reality*—the fact, namely, that we can conceive the annihilation of bodies, but cannot conceive the annihilation of space—is a fact quite comprehensible on the hypothesis that all knowledge is from without. We know space simply as *an ability to contain things* [that is, as *place*]. Whatever other idea of it we seem to have, is nothing more than a synthesis of our experiences of this ability, and may be decomposed into such experiences. We can form no notion of space without imagining dimensions. Our conceptions of it are made by abstracting from bodies their lengths and breadths [that is, conceiving lengths and breadths apart from bodies], and putting these together by themselves in a more or less distinct way; and evidently the conceptions thus formed can be essentially nothing but conceptions of an ability to contain bodies having such lengths and breadths. . . .

"But Kant does involuntary homage to the Universal Postulate [that is, the truth and authority of consciousness], in assigning grounds for his dogma. Not to dwell upon the fact that his whole argument turns upon the existence of space and time, and that for the belief in their existence the Universal Postulate [that is, the validity of consciousness] is his sole warrant; . . . we remark that he *infers*—from our inability to conceive the annihilation of space and time, conjoined with our ability to conceive the annihilation of all other things—that space and time are receptivities, sub-

jective conditions, and not objective realities. We can conceive *bodies* non-existent; we cannot conceive time and space non-existent; *therefore* time and space are forms of thought. What, now, is the worth of his *therefore?* At the best, nothing more than this, that, *given* these premises, there arises an indestructible belief in this conclusion."

But on what ground can he claim that the conclusion which he holds thus follows infallibly from his premise, is to be accepted by us as true, except that our nature constrains us to regard conclusions which we see by our reason are legitimately deduced from their premises, as infallibly involved in those premises? But it is as much a fact of consciousness, as much a matter of necessary belief, that space and time are external and independent of ourselves, as it is that conclusions which we see to be logically drawn from their premises, are actually involved in them, and, if those premises are admitted, are to be accepted as infallibly true. Kant thus assumes the infallible authority of our consciousness, and makes it the ground of his reasoning in the very argument in which he denies its truth and authority in regard to the existence of external things, and thereby overturns his whole system. He assumes the truth of consciousness to demonstrate its falsehood; he alleges the veracity and authority of one branch of our necessary and universal belief, to prove the utter error and deceptiveness of another branch of it; and thus confutes and nullifies himself. The systems of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, rest on the same false basis.

The philosophy of the Westminster is usually of the same idealistic school. It is peculiarly generous to its readers on this occasion, thus to furnish them the means of confuting so large a share of its own specious but deceptive and dangerous teachings.

Of the articles in the Edinburgh for October, that which is most likely to attract attention, treats of the clerical parties in the English establishment. Unfortunately the misconceptions and prejudices the writer betrays in a large share of his statements, are so gross, as to awaken some distrust of his other representations. He exhibits the clergy of the establishment as divided into three classes, which he denominates the low, the high, and the broad church. Each of these is divided into two or three subordinate classes. Of the low church, or the evangelical, a large division are denominated Recordites, and a principal object of his article is to caricature and ridicule them. How profound his ignorance of the gospel is, or how rancorous his party feeling, is seen from the fact that he represents the doctrines of this party as derived from the evangelical school of the last generation, by pushing each of them to extravagant consequences. "Thus," he

says, "from justification by faith, the Recordite infers the worthlessness of morality; on conversion by grace he builds a system of predestinarian fatalism; from the sole supremacy of Scripture, he derives the dogma of verbal inspiration." This, however, is as false in fact, as it is contradictious in logic. No branch of the evangelical infer the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures from their sole supremacy. So far from it, it is because the Scriptures are held to be truly the word of God, and inspired, according to their own representations, by him, that they are regarded as of supreme authority. Nor do they build a system of fatalism on conversion by grace. That is *his* inference from that doctrine of conversion, not theirs. Neither from justification by faith do they infer the worthlessness of morality. That is again his own inference, not theirs. So monstrous a statement, we will venture to say, was never uttered by an individual of the evangelical body. To hold that such morality as men *exercise*, because imperfect, is inadequate to their justification, and can contribute nothing towards securing their forgiveness and acceptance, is not to hold that it is altogether worthless in all other relations. Instead, the evangelical maintain that the very necessity of justification by grace through faith in Christ, results from the fact that the law remains in force, and that the utter failure of men to exercise the actions it demands, makes it impossible that justification can be granted except by grace, through faith in Christ. Morality, or perfect obedience to the law, they hold to be of such worth, that did men exercise it, it would insure their justification by law, and supersede the necessity of a pardon and acceptance by grace. He has the injustice also to charge that the infidelity, which he admits prevails very generally among the lower classes, is the consequence of the doctrines of the evangelical party.

"Unhappily, though the Puritan theology is attractive to a few, it is repulsive to the multitude. By most minds it is rejected at once with an instinctive repugnance. [The truth was rejected also in the same manner when proclaimed by the Son of God. 'The light then shone in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not;' but priests and rulers, as well as the lower ranks, spurned him and his message 'with instinctive repugnance,' and put him to death as a malefactor.] And yet this theology is, by the lower ranks of society in our great towns, very generally identified with Christianity itself, which has been too often presented to them in no other shape, either in the meeting-house or the church. To this circumstance may be attributed much of the infidelity now so general among the best instructed of the laboring classes. *It is a melancholy fact, that the men who make our steam-*

engines and railway carriages, our presses and telegraphs, the furniture of our houses, and the clothing of our persons, have now in fearful proportion renounced all faith in Christianity. They regard the Scripture as a forgery, and religion as a priestcraft, and are living without God in the world. This state of things, sapping as it does the very sinews of our national life, cannot be wholly laid to the charge of any one party. All are in some measure accountable for it, in so far as all have fallen short of that perfect standard of Christian goodness, the sight of which is the only effectual instrument of conversion. *But we do not hesitate to say that the party most directly guilty of driving half educated men into atheism, is that which has pushed evangelical opinions into Puritan extravagance.*"

That infidelity and atheism, in their coarsest and most virulent forms, prevail to a portentous extent among the lower ranks, seems to be indisputable. But no grosser misstatement could be framed, than the representation that they result from the doctrines of the Puritan theology. How does this writer account for their prevalence on a still greater scale among the lower ranks of France, Germany, and Italy, where no Puritan theology has been known, in any measure to attract the notice of the crowd, for three, four, five, or more generations? How would he explain their sudden and wide diffusion here, during the last twenty years, and so far as they exist in the church and among those who derive their notions from the pulpit, in connexion with doctrines that are in direct antagonism to the evangelical system? Those here in the sacred office who have been the great agents in destroying the faith of their hearers in the Bible, and leading them to infidelity, pantheism, and atheism, are the men who deny the possibility of conversion by grace, the necessity either of such a conversion, of a free justification, or of a vicarious atonement, and who exalt the authority of reason above that of God. They are the disciples of Herbert, Chubb, Tindal, Shaftsbury, Morgan, Hume, Coleridge, Kant, who, like the reviewer, instead of preaching the great doctrines of the gospel as they are held by the Puritans, employ themselves in assailing, misrepresenting, and caricaturing them, and teach a rationalistic and false system in their place. And such are the means by which they have been propagated in Great Britain and on the continent. Let this writer inquire into the origin and nature of the scepticism, the pantheism, and the atheism, of the lower orders, and he will find that they have been communicated to them by the great teachers of those false faiths of the superior ranks; the literary and cultivated, historians, essayists, poets, speculatists in metaphysics and philosophy, philologists, and theologians; the Humes, the Voltaires, the Spinozas, the Kants, the Schellings, the Schleiermachers, the Eichhorns, the De

Wettes, the Coleridges, the Strausses, the Newmans, and the Parkers. These and their coadjutors are the great propagators of infidelity and atheism. The scepticism, the false faiths, the rancorous hatred of Christianity which prevail among the crowd, have been drawn directly from them; they are of the same cast, and are maintained on identically the same grounds. The evangelical, so far from being chargeable with exciting them, are the only parties who have presented any effective barriers to their diffusion. Were their proclamation of the gospel to be intercepted for a generation, the triumph of infidelity would be universal. Not a trace of genuine Christianity would remain, either without or within the church.

The high church consists mainly, he represents, of the Anglican and Tractarian parties. The third class he denominates the broad church—by which he means, we take it, the horizontal; that is, those whose platform is the level of the present world; who are philosophic speculatists rather than Christian theologians; who feel little interest in the distinctive doctrines of the gospel; whose religion in its highest form is made up of a speculative theory and a tasteful or calculating morality; who regard the church, in a great measure, as an engine of the state, and the ministers of religion in their sphere, much what the teachers of the sciences and arts are in theirs, mere contributors to the useful culture and the refined enjoyment of men in the present life. Arnold and Maurice, leading disciples of the modern German philosophic school, he mentions as of this class. With many of them, however, the sacred office, it seems, instead of engaging their chief attention, is merely auxiliary to other pursuits. They devote themselves chiefly to the cultivation of science and literature. The clergymen of the present day, he represents, "who have richly contributed to classical philology, to the mathematical sciences, to the physical sciences, to secular history, to ecclesiastical history, to poetry, and to general literature, all, with hardly a single exception, are broad churchmen." To this class, the writer himself of the article, Dean J. W. Conybeare, of course belongs, being one of the most distinguished of the clerical cultivators of geology, and having published a learned and popular volume on the subject.

The high church party he estimates at 7000, the low church at 6500, and the broad at 3500. The picture he presents of the establishment, after all due allowances are made for errors and extravagances, is dark and portentous. Not a solitary sign appears of any amendment. The number who faithfully and earnestly preach the gospel is far less than a third, not improbably less than a fourth of the whole; and they are the objects of scorn and derision to all other parties, clerical and unclerical. Infidelity prevails to a great extent among

the lower classes; and the indications are, that when the struggle now rapidly approaching, comes, the whole, high church, broad church, and the infidels and atheists without the church, will unite against them, and endeavor to crush them into silence, or force them to proclaim a different creed.

There are several other articles in the number that are of special interest at the present time, but our space will not allow us to notice them at length.

2. Daily Bible Illustrations, being Original Readings for a year on Subjects from Sacred History, Biography, Geography, Antiquities, and Theology. Especially designed for the family circle. Evening Series, The Life and Death of our Lord. By John Kitto, D.D. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1853.

This volume treats exclusively of the events of Christ's life, and presents them in the order of their occurrence, and their connexion with each other; and as a large part of them are supernatural, and of the greatest significance and interest, they form together the finest group of themes that an author can select, and open a noble field for the taste, judgment, learning, and piety of a theological scholar; and they are skilfully handled by Dr. Kitto. His studies have fitted him especially for the descriptive and illustrative branches of his work; and he furnishes, in a brief compass, a great amount of important information gleaned from ancient and modern inquirers respecting the places that are mentioned in the gospels, the manners and customs of the people, and the historical events that need explanation. It is a most entertaining and delightsome as well as instructive work, and deserves a place in every family.

3. The Attractions of the World to Come. By the Rev. Alfred Bryant, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Niles, Michigan. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1853.

This work treats mostly of subjects of which even the religious generally entertain but very vague ideas. Such, especially, are the condition of the departed during their intermediate existence; the resurrection of the righteous; and the employments and enjoyments of their immortal life. Even of their resurrection, which the Scriptures everywhere exhibit as one of the most important and glorious elements of their redemption, the church has, almost altogether, lost sight. Thousands appear to attach to it scarcely the slightest importance. Were it struck from the Divine purposes, it would hardly in the faintest degree, according to their views, impair the complete-

ness of redemption. They suppose the bliss of the holy is essentially consummated on their entrance into the invisible world. To not a few, indeed, a reunion to their bodies is rather dreaded than desired, as likely to prove an obstruction to their powers, and a bar to their happiness, instead of perfecting their nature, and fitting them for the exalted sphere they are thereafter to fill. That death is a curse to them, as well as others, and that a disembodied life, even though unstained by sin and free from suffering, is yet quite imperfect, involving a vast limitation on the capacities, the activities, and the blessedness of the righteous, and indicating, in a most emphatic manner, that they are under the great penalty that is inflicted on sinners here,—they have, at best, but a faint and glimmering apprehension. On this and other kindred topics, Mr. Bryant has collected the intimations that are presented in the Scriptures, raised them out of the obscurity in which inconsideration, unbelief, and false speculation have involved them, and set them forth with a distinctness and beauty that are eminently adapted to engage the interest of his readers. Though all his views may not be accepted, they cannot fail, in the main, to prove highly instructive and delightful.

The subjects of which he treats are very numerous. Among those embraced in the chapter on the nature of future happiness, besides the affections that are essential elements of it, are the necessity of a material world or place as the residence of the righteous and scene of their activity, the society of that world, personal recognitions and friendships, pleasures of seeing and hearing, delights of advancing knowledge and activity in doing good, differences in degrees of glory. It will be felt, however, by many to be a defect in the chapter, that he has not presented, with the clearness to which it is entitled, the great truth revealed most distinctly in the Scriptures, that this world, redeemed from the curse and reinvested with its original beauty, is to be the seat for ever of Christ's kingdom, and the scene in which the risen saints are to exercise their kingly authority. The kingdom of Christ and the saints which is to be established here on the overthrow of the fourth beast, and is to comprise all the dominions of the earth, is not to pass away, but is to continue for ever.

The volume is entitled to an extensive circulation. Those whose views of a future existence are but shadowy and vacillating, to whom the grave is but an object of horror, and the invisible world an abyss of darkness, will find in it a bright and cheering light reflected from the sacred page, gilding even the night of the sepulchre, and shedding a dazzling glory on the interminable life that lies beyond.

Several notices, excluded from this number, will appear in the next.

THE

THEOLOGICAL AND LITERARY JOURNAL.

VOLUME VI. APRIL, 1854. NUMBER IV.

Art. I.—Christ's Second Coming.

BY THE EDITOR.

In our previous article on this subject, we alleged a large array of passages which foreshow that Christ's second coming is to take place at the time of the destruction of the antichristian powers, and the resurrection of the holy dead; and is therefore to precede the millennium. We are now to adduce another series of predictions, in which it is foretold that his coming is to contemporize with the restoration of the Israelites to their national land, which is also to precede the reign of the thousand years.

III. That the Israelites are to be recalled from their present dispersion, reinvested with their ancient inheritance, and subsist there for ever as a distinct people, and under a theocratic government, is announced in the most unequivocal and emphatic terms in a great number of passages. It will be sufficient to cite Hosea and Amos.

"For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod and teraphim. Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king, and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in *the latter days*."—Hosea iii. 4, 5.

"I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord: For lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth. All the sinners of my people which say, The evil shall not overtake nor prevent us, shall die by the sword. In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old; that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt. And I will bring again the captivity of my people of Israel, and they shall build the waste cities, and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and drink the wine thereof; they shall also make gardens, and eat the fruit of them. And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land which I have given them, saith the Lord thy God."—Amos ix. 9–15.

Here are thus explicit predictions of the restoration of the Israelites to their national inheritance, accompanied by enumerations of events that are to precede it, and definitions of its period, which show with the most ample certainty that it has not yet been accomplished. It is to take place after their being sifted among all nations, and therefore subsequently to their dispersion by the Romans; and consequently, it is still future; as their only return that has hitherto taken place, was from a captivity among the Assyrians and Babylonians only, not from among the nations generally. It is to be after they have long been "without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod and teraphim." It is, therefore, not only to be after their return from Babylon, up to which time they had princes; but after the destruction of the temple by the Romans, to which period they had sacrifices and an ephod; and it is thus still future, as no restoration of the nation has taken place since that period. And finally, it is to be a return that is never to be followed by another exile; and therefore is yet to be accomplished, as no such restoration has as yet taken place. There are pre-

dictions of their restoration in many other passages—as Isaiah lxvi. 15–24; Jeremiah xxxiii.; Ezekiel xxxiv.

It is foreshown, also, with equal explicitness, that their conversion universally to faith in the Messiah, is to take place at the period of their restoration.

"For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you from all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments; and ye shall dwell in the land I gave your fathers, and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God."—Ezekiel xxxvi. 24–28.

There are many similar predictions in Isaiah, and the other prophets.

"O thou afflicted, tossed with a tempest and not comforted, behold I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires; and I will make thy windows with agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones. And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children. In righteousness shalt thou be established: thou shalt be far from oppression, for thou shalt not fear; and from terror, for it shall not come nigh thee."—Isaiah liv. 11–14. "Thy people also shall be all righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever, the branch of my planting, the work of my hands, that I may be glorified."—lx. 21.

That restoration is most indubitably, therefore, still future. It is as certainly future now, as it was when Paul wrote Romans xi. 25, 26; as no such conversion of the nation has yet taken place.

At the time of their restoration and conversion, Christ is to become their King, and is to reign over them in visible majesty. This is foreshown in a number of passages.

"I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful and increase. And I will set up shepherds

over them, which shall feed them; and they shall fear no more nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord. Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is the name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt: but, The Lord liveth which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and *from all countries whither I had driven them;* and they shall dwell in their own land."—Jeremiah xxiii. 3–8.

This also is most certainly still future. Christ has not hitherto reigned as King in the earth; neither has Judah hitherto been saved by him, nor Israel dwelt safely under his sceptre. He is not to receive the earth as his kingdom, and assume the dominion of the nations, until the seventh trumpet sounds, and the Ancient of days comes and consigns the antichristian powers to destruction. Rev. xi. 15; Dan. vii. 13, 14.

We shall now show that the restoration and conversion of the Israelites are to take place at the time of Christ's second coming, destruction of the antichristian hosts, and commencement of his millennial reign. It is foreshown in the prediction of Christ's reign, Isaiah xi. The prophecy first announces him as the descendant of David, who had been promised as the everlasting inheritor of his throne, 2 Sam. vii. 16, and describes his attributes as a king, and the characteristics of his reign.

"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots; and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth. And he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."—Vs. 1–4.

The reign here foreshown is thus to commence with a discrimination of the humble and meek from the wicked, and the destruction of the latter by avenging judgments: and in exercising these acts of discrimination and vengeance, he is to be personally and visibly present; for he is to smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and slay the wicked with the breath of his lips, which bespeak his visible presence; and the latter, we are accordingly shown in the New Testament, is the instrument with which he is to destroy the man of sin at his second coming, 2 Thess. ii. 8; and the former is the symbol with which he is represented as slaying the armies of the beast and kings at the last great battle at Armageddon, Rev. xix. 11–21. The period of his exercising these judicial and destroying acts, is therefore that of his second coming, and overthrow of the antichristian powers. That destruction, it is next foreshown, is to be followed by the millennium in which he is to reign in righteousness.

"And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins. The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."—Vs. 5–9.

That this period is to be the period of the new heaven and new earth, when Christ is to reign here visibly, and sorrow, want, suffering, and death are no longer to be known, is expressly shown, chapter lxv. 17–25, which we are hereafter to quote. And it is at this period that the restoration of the Israelites is to take place.

"And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek; and his rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass *in that day*, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And

he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim. But they shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines toward the west; they shall spoil them of the east together; they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon shall obey them. And the Lord shall utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and shall smite it into seven streams, and make men go over dry-shod. And there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people which shall be left from Assyria, like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt."—Vs. 10–16.

The time when the Israelites are to be recalled from their dispersion in the different parts of the globe, is thus to be the time when Christ executes his avenging judgments on the wicked at his second coming, and institutes his millennial reign. It is to be "in that day." And Christ is then to manifest himself to the nations; for he is to stand as a signal to them; his "rest," the scene of his manifestation, is to be "glorious," that is, invested with splendor, and is therefore to be visible; and the Gentiles are to seek to it, that is, go thither, as is foreshown chapter ii. 2, 3, to offer their homage and learn his will. And this is shown also in the song of gratitude and joy that follows, chapter xii.: "In that day shall ye say, Praise the Lord, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted. Sing unto the Lord, for he hath done excellent things: this is known in all the earth. Cry out and shout, thou inhabitant of Zion; *for great is the Holy One of Israel* IN THE MIDST OF THEE."—Vs. 4–6.

The prophecy thus clearly foreshows that the restoration and conversion of the Israelites are to take place at the time of Christ's visible coming, execution of his final judgments on the antichristian hosts, creation of the new heaven and new earth, and commencement of his millennial reign. This is indisputably the grammatical sense of the passage; and it is as unquestionably its only meaning. The attempts of mentators to fasten on it a wholly different signification,

on the assumption that it is figurative, are entirely unauthorized. The figures that occur in it, near forty in number, instead of investing it with a different sense, are employed for the very purpose of clearly and impressively expressing the signification we have ascribed to it, and have in that their whole office. There are no figures by which it could be made the vehicle of the sense which those commentators assign to it,—a prediction of the conversion of the Gentiles, in place of a restoration of the Israelites. They in fact, under the fancy that the Israelites are used representatively, treat it as though it were allegoric or symbolical; but that, as we shall at a later stage of the discussion show, is altogether mistaken, and involves a total violation of the prediction.

There is a similar prediction in Isaiah lxvi.

"Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with her, all ye that love her; rejoice with joy for her, all ye that mourn for her: that ye may suck and be satisfied with the breasts of her consolations; that ye may milk out and be delighted with the abundance of her glory. For thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream: then shall ye suck; ye shall be borne upon her sides, and dandled upon her knees. As one whom his mother comforteth, so will I comfort you; and ye shall be comforted in Jerusalem."—Vs. 10–13.

But when is her deliverance from the power of her enemies,—which it is shown, vs. 5–9, is to be accomplished instantaneously and miraculously,—and her introduction into this peaceful and prosperous condition, to take place? When Jehovah comes—the answer is—in flaming fire, to judge the nations and inflict vengeance on the apostates.

"And when ye see this, your heart shall rejoice, and your bones shall flourish like an herb, *and the hand of the Lord shall be known toward his* SERVANTS, *and his indignation toward his* ENEMIES. *For, behold,* THE LORD WILL COME WITH FIRE, AND WITH HIS CHARIOTS LIKE A WHIRLWIND, *to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire; for by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh, and the slain of the Lord shall be many.* They that sanctify themselves and purify themselves in the gardens behind one tree in the midst, eating swines' flesh, and the abomination, and the mouse, *shall be consumed together,* saith the Lord."—Vs. 14–17.

This is clearly to be a personal and visible coming. It is such an advent, and such an advent alone, that the language describes. It is JEHOVAH HIMSELF who is to appear in the scene; not some other being, or the mere elements of the physical world. He is to COME, not merely exert his power there, or employ the agents of the natural world to accomplish his will. He is to come WITH FLAMES OF FIRE AND WITH HIS CHARIOTS, not invisibly, or merely, without coming, employ the instrumentality of men to execute his vengeance. Mere acts of providence do not come with chariots; neither are the chariots of Jehovah invisible, nor the flames of fire with which he is to consume his enemies. It is to contradict their nature to suppose that they are to be invisible. The commentators who attempt to force such a sense on the language, might as well assert that the chariots are to be without form, and the fire without heat. It is held by metaphysicians to be the highest possible proof of the falsehood of a proposition, that that which it affirms is inconceivable; and that is the character of the construction which represents that the advent of Jehovah here foretold is to be *invisible:* For who can conceive of invisible chariots, that is, chariots that cannot be perceived by the eye, that therefore have neither extension, shape, nor color; and that consequently are not in any *place?* Who can conceive of flames of fire that have neither any form, color, nor motion; and consequently are not in any *place?* What admirable masters of their profession are the critics who, to carry out a false theory, plunge into this abyss of contradiction and absurdity! But perhaps it will be said that the *mode* of the advent here described is merely *figurative*, or indicates nothing more than that the acts God is then to exert are to be terrific and overwhelming to his enemies. To this we reply, in the first place, that that assumption is gratuitous, and against the laws of the metaphor which is supposed to be used in the passage: for when that figure is employed in predicating an act of an agent, the act is always one that is not literally possible to him, but only *resembles* one that is suitable to his nature; as when the fields are said to *smile*, and the clouds to *frown*. But the acts here ascribed to Jehovah are not impossible, nor inappropriate to him. Instead, the mode of the advent here foreshown of him, is essentially that in

which he appeared to the prophets, Ps. xviii., Isa. vi., Ezek. i. and x., and that in which it is expressly predicted he is to come at the destruction of the fourth beast, Dan. vii., and the man of sin, and his enemies generally, 2 Thess. i. and ii. In the next place, even the supposition that the passage is metaphorical, assumes that Jehovah is thus really to *come* to the earth and destroy his enemies by his own act: as it is a law of the metaphor, that the agent to whom the figurative act is ascribed, is always the real agent of the act which the metaphor is used to signify. On the ground, then, on which these mistaken interpreters proceed, Jehovah is in fact to come in person to the earth, and exert the acts by which his enemies are to be destroyed. Their supposition, therefore, that the passage is metaphorical, does not prevent it from announcing a real personal advent of Jehovah, and confuting their inference that the acts he is to exert are to be mere acts of his ordinary providence. As he is indisputably to come in person, his advent and acts will as indisputably be visible, and suitable in their greatness and awfulness to his attributes, the vindication of his rights, and the manifestation of his glory. But in the third place, the supposition that the passage is metaphorical, is precluded by the comparison that is made in it of Jehovah's coming with fire and with his chariots, to a whirlwind;—or according to the more accurate translation of Le Clerc, J. A. Alexander, and others, "Jehovah comes in fire, and like a whirlwind his chariots," in which there is only a comparison of the movement of his chariots to a whirlwind:—as in that figure the objects compared are always those which the terms by which they are designated literally denote, as in the similes of the Psalmist: "For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is the mercy of Jehovah toward them that fear him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him. As for man, his days are as grass: as a flower of the field, so he flourisheth; for the wind passeth over it and it is gone," Ps. ciii. 11–16; where the things compared are those which the names by which they are designated literally express. And that is the law of the figure universally and necessarily, as otherwise there would be no means of knowing what the objects

are that are compared. What can Jehovah's chariots mean, if they do not mean his chariots? and what can a whirlwind mean, if it does not mean a whirlwind? The fact that the coming of Jehovah's chariots is compared to the rush of a whirlwind, presents the most absolute demonstration, accordingly, that his chariots are actually to come, and that his advent, therefore, is to be personal and visible. The attempt to exclude this sense by the pretence that the passage is metaphorical, thus defeats itself.

When then is this advent in fire and with chariots rushing like a whirlwind, to take place? The answer is, at the time of the restoration of the Israelites and the creation of the new heavens and the new earth, at the commencement of Christ's millennial reign.

"For I know their works and thoughts: it shall come that I will gather all nations and tongues, and they shall come and see my glory. And I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations, upon horses and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord, as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel into the house of the Lord. And I will also take of them for priests and for Levites, saith the Lord. For as the new heavens and the new earth which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they shall go forth and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh."—Vs. 18–24.

The time when Jehovah is to come in fire and his chariots as a whirlwind and destroy his enemies, is thus the time when the Israelites are to be restored from their dispersion among all nations, and Jerusalem is to be created a rejoicing, and her people a joy. And that advent of Jehovah and that restoration of the Israelites are to be personal and visible;

as the comparison that is made of the continuance of that people before him to the endurance of the new heavens and new earth which he is then to create, demonstrates, according to the law of the simile we have already stated, that the objects that are thus compared are those which their names literally denote. The supposition indeed that they are not; that, as those claim who hold the prophecy to be metaphorical, the new heavens and new earth denote a new state of the church, and that the Israelites mean the Gentiles who are to constitute the church; is to make the objects compared identically the same, and convert the simile into nonsense. For it then becomes a mere assurance that, as the new state of the church which God is to create shall remain before him, so shall the individuals who constitute the church in that state remain! What admirable proofs they give of their knowledge of the laws of language who thus put the word of God on the rack and wrench from it all its legitimate meaning, in order to bring it into harmony with their unauthorized theories! But the comparison of the permanence of the heaven and earth and of the Israelites in the passage, prohibits that outrage, and cuts off the pretence therefore on the one hand, that the Israelites are not the real subjects of the predicted restoration, nor the restoration a real one; and on the other, that the time of their restoration is not to be the time of Christ's second coming, and the creation of the new heavens and new earth at the beginning of the millennium. For at the creation of the new heavens and new earth, God, we are expressly assured, Rev. xxi. 1–11, is to descend and dwell with men, and the new Jerusalem, the symbol of the risen and glorified saints, is to come down from heaven and be the scene of his visible presence; and that creation of the new heavens and new earth, we are explicitly shown, Isaiah lxv., is to be followed by the residence of the Israelites in their ancient capital and land, in millennial peace, prosperity, and happiness.

"For behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create; for behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy; and I will rejoice in Jerusalem, and joy in my people: and the voice of weeping shall be

all nations, and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat, and will plead with them there for my people and my heritage Israel, whom they have scattered among the nations and parted my land." —Joel ii. 28–32; iii. 1, 2.

The period when these events are to take place is thus declared to be that of the restoration of God's people from their captivity among the nations, and the extraordinary signals that are to precede their restoration in the heavens and on the earth, are those which Christ announced to his disciples, as immediately to precede his coming in the clouds of heaven, to gather and judge the nations, and redeem his people. The prophet then summons the nations to assemble their hosts at Jerusalem, predicts again that the sun and moon shall then be darkened, and announces that Jehovah shall then utter his voice from Zion, and give deliverance to his people.

"Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles: Prepare war; wake up the mighty men; let all the men of war draw near; let them come up; beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong. Assemble yourselves and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord: Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about. Put ye in the sickle, for the harvest is ripe; come, get you down, for the press is full, the fats overflow; for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes in the valley of decision: for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision. The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the earth shall shake; but the Lord will be the hope of his people, and the strength of the children of Israel. So shall ye know that I am the Lord your God, dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain. Then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no stranger pass through her any more."—Chap. iii. 9–17.

The gathering of the nations here foretold, is that of the great battle of God Almighty at Armageddon, predicted also Zech. xiv. 1–15, and Rev. xix. 11–21, whose object is to be to conquer and disperse the Israelites who will have returned to

Jerusalem, and thereby confute the expectation of God's people that Christ is to establish his throne there, destroy his foes, and extend his dominion over the whole earth. And Jehovah is then to appear visibly—for he is to shake the heavens and the earth with the thunder of his voice—and is to judge and destroy his enemies, and give deliverance to his people. The facts that the assemblage is to consist of armed hosts; that their aim is to be to perpetuate the captivity and dispersion of the Israelites, and thereby prevent Christ's reigning on Mount Zion; that Jehovah is to interpose in person to save his people, and judge and destroy their assailants; and that his interposition is to be preceded by the signs in the sun and moon which are to herald Christ's coming in the clouds to judge and destroy his enemies, show most clearly that the epoch is the same. There are not to be two great sieges of Jerusalem, or battles in Palestine, in which Jehovah is to interpose in person and devour his enemies with fire. There are not to be two judgments and destructions of the anti-christian powers, symbolized by the beast and false prophet, Rev. xix., Dan. vii. There are not to be two such crises at which the sun and moon are to be darkened, the stars fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven be shaken, v. 15, 16, Matt. xxiv. 29. The advent here foreshown is unquestionably therefore Christ's second coming, and the judgment that of the hostile hosts that are symbolized, Dan. vii., Rev. vi. 13–17, xi. 18, and xix. 11–21, and foretold also Zech. xiv. and Isaiah lxvi. They are accordingly to be followed by the renovation of the earth, and the millennial reign of Jehovah in Zion.

"And it shall come to pass in that day that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord and shall water the valley of Shittim. Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate wilderness for the violence against the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land. But Judah shall dwell for ever, and Jerusalem from generation to generation. For I will cleanse their blood which I have not cleansed; for the Lord dwelleth in Zion."—Joel iii. 18–21.

This is the period of the new heaven and new earth fore-

shown Isaiah lxv. and Amos ix., when God is to make Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy; when there is to be no more weeping, sorrow, nor want, but the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine; the wolf and the lamb shall feed together; and Jehovah shall dwell in Zion and manifest to all nations his glory.

The contemporaneousness of these events is foreshown also by Zephaniah. God first announces his purpose to gather the nations together, and devour them with the fire of his indignation, and cut off also the incorrigible of his own people; and then to convert the survivors of the Israelites, and cause them to dwell in their land in righteousness and peace.

"Therefore wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms to pour upon them mine indignation, all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy. For then will I turn [change] to the people a pure lip, *that they may all call upon the name of the Lord to serve him with one consent.* From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia my suppliants, the daughters of my dispersed, shall bring mine offering. In that day thou shalt not feel shame for deeds such as those with which thou hast [heretofore] transgressed against me: for then I will take away out of the midst of thee them that rejoice in thy pride, and thou shalt no more be haughty because of my holy mountain, and I will leave in the midst of thee an afflicted and poor people, and they shall trust in the name of the Lord. The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity, nor speak lies; neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth: for they shall feed and lie down, and none shall make them afraid."—Chap. iii. 8–13.

These events are most certainly still future. No such destruction of the nations by fire has happened. No such conversion of the surviving Israelites, and peaceful occupation of their ancient land, have taken place. That gathering of the nations is undoubtedly to be to the last great battle of Armageddon; and the fire with which they are to be devoured, the flaming fire in which Christ is to be revealed, when he comes with his mighty angels to take vengeance on those that acknowledge him not, and obey not his gospel, 2 Thess. i. 7, 8. It is next announced accordingly that the

Israelites shall then be delivered from all their calamities and sorrows; that their dispersed shall be restored to their national inheritance; and that God shall thereafter dwell in the midst of them, and make them the objects of wonder and admiration to all the inhabitants of the earth.

"Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all thy heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord hath taken away thy judgments, he hath cast out thine enemy: the King of Israel, the Lord, is in the midst of thee; thou shalt not see evil any more.

"In that day it shall be said to Jerusalem, Fear thou not; and to Zion, Let not thine hands be slack. The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty; he will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy; he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing. I will gather the sorrowful for the solemn assembly who are of thee, the reproach of which is a burden. Behold, at that time I will undo all that afflict thee: and I will save her that halteth, and gather her that was driven out; and I will get them praise and fame in every land where they have been put to shame. At that time will I bring you again, in the time that I gather you; for I will make you a name and a praise among all people of the earth, when I turn back your captivity before your eyes, saith the Lord."—Vs. 14–20.

Here is thus an explicit promise of their recall from their captivity, their re-establishment in their own land and restoration to the divine favor, the reign of Jehovah their King in the midst of them, and their everlasting exemption thereafter from every form of evil. The period of these events is to be the period, therefore, of Christ's second coming, overthrow of the antichristian powers, and institution of his millennial reign, when all things are to become new, and toil, suffering, want, sorrow, and death are to be known no more.

It is predicted also by Ezekiel, that at the time of their restoration to their land, Jehovah shall establish his tabernacle, in which he visibly revealed himself, among them, that the Messiah shall then be their King, and reign over them, and that they shall be universally sanctified, and enjoy their ancient inheritance under his gracious sceptre through an everlasting series of generations.

"Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel: and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all, neither shall they defile themselves with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions: but I will save them out of all their dwelling-places wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be my people, and I will be their God: and David my servant shall be king over them: and they shall all have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them: it shall be an everlasting covenant with them; and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them: yea, I will be their God, and they shall be my people; and the Gentiles shall know that I, Jehovah, do sanctify Israel, when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore."—Chap. xxxvii. 21–28.

Such a universal restoration and sanctification of the nation has never yet taken place. Their dispersion is now more absolute, indeed, and their alienation from God more general than they were at the time of the prediction. The return and conversion here foreshown are yet future. When the Israelites are thus restored and converted, God is for ever to establish his sanctuary among them, in which he will reveal himself visibly, and from that wonderful distinction—such are to be the displays of his majesty there—all the nations of the world will see that the Israelites are, as a people, consecrated in an especial manner to Jehovah; and Christ, the great descendant of David and heir of his throne, is then to be their king, reign over them and bless them with peace, prosperity, and happiness, through an eternal succession of generations. That this great Prince is the Messiah, and that he is then to reign in person and appear in visible majesty in his sanctuary at Jerusalem, is placed

beyond all doubt by a symbolical vision, in which the temple itself, then to be erected on Mount Zion, was presented to the eyes of the prophet, and he beheld Jehovah descending in majesty from heaven, and entering it, filling it with his glory, and proclaiming it as the seat of his throne, and his dwelling-place for ever.

"Afterwards he brought me to the gate, the gate that looketh toward the east; and behold, the glory of the God of Israel came from the way of the east; and his voice was like a noise of many waters; and the earth shined with his glory. And it was according to the appearance of the vision which I saw; according to the vision that I saw when I came to destroy the city: and the visions were like the vision I saw by the river Chebar; and I fell upon my face. And the glory of the Lord came into the house by the way of the gate whose prospect is toward the east. So the Spirit took me up, and brought me into the inner court; and behold, the glory of the Lord filled the house. And I heard him speaking unto me out of the house; and the man stood by me. And he said unto me, Son of man; the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name shall the house of Israel no more defile."—Chap. xliii. 1–7.

As Jehovah in this vision, according to the law of divine symbols, represented himself, so his coming in the vision in glory, and entering into the temple and proclaiming it his everlasting throne in the midst of the children of Israel, symbolizes his real coming in visible glory, entrance into the temple, of which that beheld by the prophet was the representative, and reigning there as the King of that people: and the time when he is to come in that manner and commence his reign there, it is shown in the subsequent part of the vision, is the period of their restoration to their ancient land, at the creation of the new heaven and new earth, when Jerusalem is to become a rejoicing and her people a joy, and when tears and sorrow, want and suffering, are to be known no more.

"Afterwards he brought me again unto the door of the house; and behold, waters issued out from under the threshold of the house eastward; for the forefront of the house stood toward the east, and

the waters came down from under from the right side of the house, at the south side of the altar. Then brought he me out of the way of the gate northward, and led me about the way without unto the outer gate, by the way that looketh eastward: and behold, there ran out waters on the right side. And when the man that had the line in his hand went forth eastward, he measured a thousand cubits, and he brought me through the waters; the waters were to the ankles. Again he measured a thousand, and brought me through the waters; the waters were to the knees. Again he measured a thousand, and brought me through; the waters were to the loins. Afterward he measured a thousand; and it was a river that I could not pass over: for the waters were risen, waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over. And he said unto me, Son of man, hast thou seen? Then he brought me, and caused me to return to the brink of the river. Now, when I had returned, behold at the bank of the river, very many trees on the one side and on the other. Then said he unto me, These waters issue out toward the east country, and go down into the desert, and go into the sea; and being brought forth into the sea, the waters shall be healed. . . . . And by the river upon the bank thereof, on this side and on that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the fruit thereof be consumed: it shall bring forth new fruit according to his months, because their waters they issued out of the sanctuary; and the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and the leaf thereof for medicine."—Chap. xlvii. 1–12.

That the things here symbolized belong to the period of the new heavens and the new earth, when Christ and the risen saints are to reign here, is seen from the exhibition in the Apocalypse, chapter xxii. 1, 2, of a similar river, as proceeding from the throne of God and the Lamb in the new Jerusalem, with trees of life on its banks yielding fruit every month, and leaves for the healing of the nations. The coming of Christ, the restoration of the Israelites, the renovation of the world, and the commencement of the millennial reign, are therefore to be of the same period.

There is a similar prediction in Zechariah. The prophet first foreshows that the nations are to gather together against Jerusalem, and that God will defend the city and destroy them in an extraordinary manner.

"The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, saith the Lord,

which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundations of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him. Behold, I will make Jerusalem a cup of trembling unto all the people round about, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and against Jerusalem. And in that day will I make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people: all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it. In that day, saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with astonishment, and his rider with madness: and I will open mine eyes upon the house of Judah, and will smite every horse of the people with blindness. And the governors of Judah shall say in their heart, The inhabitants of Jerusalem are strength in the Lord of hosts, their God. In that day will I make the governors of Judah like a hearth of fire among the wood, and like a torch of fire in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the people round about, on the right hand and on the left; and Jerusalem shall be inhabited again in her own place, even in Jerusalem. The Lord also shall save the tents of Judah first, that the glory of the house of David, and the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, do not magnify itself above Judah. In that day shall the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David; and the house of David as God, as the angel of the Lord before them. And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem."—Chap. xii. 1–9.

That the conflict here described is to be a conflict between Judah and the Gentile nations, and that it is the Jews, not, as the allegorizing interpreters maintain, some analogous class of persons, that are to be delivered, is shown by the similes in which they are compared, in their assault on the Gentiles, to a hearth-fire among wood, and a burning torch in a sheaf of grain; and the feeble among them is likened to David, and the house of David to the angel of Jehovah, the Messiah: as in that figure, as already stated, the agents or things compared are always those which their names literally denote. No law of language is more certain; and it sets aside for ever the pretence that this and other similar prophecies, under the names of Judah and Jerusalem, merely treat of convèrted Gentiles. This deliverance is to be followed by an effusion of the Spirit upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and a visible manifestation

of Christ to them, and their repentance, faith, and acceptance.

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplications, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one is in bitterness for his first born. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon. And the land shall mourn every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart; the family of Shimei apart, and their wives apart; all the families that remain; every family apart, and their wives apart. In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin, and for uncleanness."—Chap. xii. 10–14; xiii. 1.

That Christ is then to reveal himself to them openly, and be recognised by them as their Messiah, is expressly shown in the announcement that "they shall look upon me whom they have pierced," as they cannot look upon him unless he is present and visible. It is indicated also by the bitterness of their sorrow, and their inquiry what the wounds are in his hands; and it is placed beyond question, by the quotation of the language by John in the Apocalypse, to show that when he comes in the clouds, and visibly to every eye, they also who pierced him shall see him. "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they who pierced him, and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him," Rev. i. 7. As in this passage, they who pierced him are to see him with the eye, so they in Zechariah, who are to look upon him, are to look upon him with the eye; and therefore he is to be personally present and visible to them. And this is expressly shown again, in a later passage in the prophecy, chap. xiv. 1–4, in which it is announced that when Jehovah gathers all nations against Jerusalem, and the city has been taken, the houses rifled, and one half of the population carried forth captives, "then will the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle, and *his feet shall stand*

in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof, toward the east and toward the west, a very great valley, and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south, and ye shall flee to the valley of the mountains, and *the Lord my God shall come, and all his saints with thee*;" and it is added, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth; in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one."—Chap. xiv. 1–5, 9. His coming is therefore to be literal, is to take place at the epoch of the last great battle with the antichristian powers, the deliverance and conversion of the Israelites, and the commencement of the millennial reign.

Christ's visible interposition to deliver the Israelites at the time of their restoration, is foretold by Micah:

"I will surely assemble, O Jacob, all of thee; I will surely gather the remnant of Israel: I will put them together as the sheep of Bozrah, as the flock in the midst of their fold: they shall make great noise by reason of [the multitude of] men. The Breaker is come up before them: they have broken up and passed through the gate, and are gone out by it: and their King shall pass before them, and Jehovah at their head."—Chap. ii. 12, 13.

The re-assembling of the Israelites here predicted is to embrace the whole of them. Not an individual is to be left in exile; and their multitude is to be such, that the noise of their movement is to be great, like that of an army. It is, therefore, still future. No universal restoration of the ten tribes, who alone had been carried into captivity at the time of this prophecy, has yet taken place; nor any return that answered at all in numbers to this description. The whole who were restored from Babylon amounted to but a few thousands; and they, with at most few exceptions, were of the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin. The Breaker—he who crushes every barrier, who makes a way through every obstacle to their return—is their King Jehovah, and he is to pass before them as their leader; and is therefore to be visibly present, as he was in conducting them from Egypt. The attempts of their conquerors to retain those whom they have carried into captivity, Zech. xiv. 2, in camps or fortified cities,

are to be vain. Jehovah is to appear at their head, dash the gates within which they are inclosed, and leading them homeward, dry up the Red Sea for their passage, and divide the Euphrates, that they may pass it dry shod.—Isaiah xi. 15, 16.

There is a still more specific prediction of his coming and reign over them at the time of their restoration, chap. iv. and v. After announcing, chap. iv. 1–5, that "in the last days the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it," the prophet adds:

"In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and I will gather her that is driven out, and her that I have afflicted, and I will make her that halted a remnant [that shall return], and her that was cast far off a strong nation; and the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion, from henceforth even for ever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the first dominion: the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."—Vs. 6–8.

Before their deliverance they were to be trampled down by their enemies and carried into captivity; but at length they shall triumph over their oppressors, and tread them down like sheaves on a threshing floor.

"Now also many nations are gathered against thee, that say, Let her be defiled, and let our eye look upon Zion. But they know not the thoughts of the Lord, neither understand they his counsel; for he shall gather them [the nations], as the sheaves into the floor. Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion; for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thy hoof brass: and thou shalt beat in pieces many people, and I will consecrate their gain unto the Lord, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth."—Vs. 10–13.

No such victory over their enemies has yet been achieved by them. They never conquered the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Medes and Persians, the Greeks, the Syrians, nor the Romans; nor consecrated the spoils of those nations to Jehovah. The prediction is yet to be fulfilled. It is accordingly foreshown in the next chapter, that it is to take place

after a long dispersion, to which they were to be subjected subsequently to Christ's first coming and crucifixion.

"They shall smite the judge of Israel with a rod upon the cheek. But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting. *Therefore will I give them up*, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel, and he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of Jehovah his God; and they shall abide; for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth."—Chap. v. 1–4.

It is thus foreshown that after Christ's first coming and being smitten on the cheek, Matt. xxvi. 67, the Israelites were, because of their rejection of him, to be given up to dispersion among their enemies, till the time should come when they should endeavor, like one in a birth struggle, Isaiah lxvi. 7–9, liv. 1–3, to extricate themselves, and return and reorganize as a nation in their own land: when he shall interpose in the majesty of Jehovah as their ruler, and shall cause them to abide in their inheritance, because he shall then be great unto the ends of the earth; that is, shall be the King of kings and Lord of lords, and bring all nations under his dominion, so that there shall be no foe left who can make war on them, and carry them again into captivity. But when that great moment arrives, and Christ and his flaming legions interpose in their behalf, instead of being any longer helplessly trampled down by their foes, they are to gain a victory over them.

"And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forest, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep, who, if he go through, both treadeth down, and teareth in pieces, and none can deliver. Thine hand shall be lifted up upon thine adversaries, and all thine enemies shall be cut off."—Vs. 8, 9.

Christ's second coming, therefore, and the commencement of his reign over the nations, are to take place at the time of

the restoration of the Israelites and destruction of the hostile powers that endeavor to retain them in subjection.

The contemporaneousness of these events is revealed also, Zech. ix.

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just and having salvation, lowly and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off, and he shall speak peace unto the heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth."—Vs. 9, 10.

But when is the King of Zion thus to come to her, destroy all the implements of war, and extend his dominion over the whole earth? When he delivers the Israelites from their captivity, vii. 12, and restores them to their own land, v. 16.

"As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant [the covenant I have made with thee ratified by blood], I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water. Return ye to the stronghold [Jerusalem], ye prisoners of hope; even to-day do I declare I will render double unto thee; when I have bent Judah for me, filled the bow with Ephraim, and raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Javan, and made thee as the sword of a mighty man."—Vs. 11–13.

When thus released from their captivity as from a prison, summoned to return to their ancient capital, and prepared to be used as God's instruments in destroying their enemies, then shall Jehovah visibly appear for their deliverance, and flash his devouring lightnings on their foes.

"*And the Lord shall be seen over them, his arrow shall* go forth as the lightning, and the Lord God shall blow the trumpet, and shall go with whirlwinds of the south. The Lord of hosts shall defend them: and they shall devour and subdue with sling-stones; and they shall drink and make a noise as through wine; and they shall be filled like bowls, as the corners of the altar. And the Lord their God shall save them in that day, as the flock of his people: for they shall be as the stones of a crown lifted up as an ensign upon his land."—Vs. 14–16.

Their restoration is thus to take place when Jehovah comes visibly in the clouds, and darting his lightnings on the

hosts arrayed against them, gives them a final deliverance from their power; and that is to be at the commencement of Christ's millennial reign, when he puts an end for ever to war, and extends his peaceful and gracious dominion over all the nations of the world.

There are other passages in the Old Testament in which these events are exhibited as contemporaneous, as Isaiah iv. 2–6; ix. 1–7; xxiv., xxv., xxvi., xxx. 18–43; xxxii.–xxxv., and nearly the whole that follow. The restoration of the Israelites from their captivity, their sanctification, acceptance, and deliverance from all the avenging judgments with which they have been smitten; the destruction of their enemies, the reign of Jehovah over them in majesty, and the renovation of the earth, are everywhere conjoined as events of the same happy period. So also Jeremiah xxiii. 1–8; xxx., xxxi., and xxxiii.; Hosea i. 10; ii. 14–23; iii. 4, 5; xiii. 9–14.

But we turn to the New Testament, in which it is also foretold that the second coming of Christ is to take place at the time of the restoration of the Israelites. Thus Christ announces that at the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, the Israelites were to fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away captive into all nations; and that Jerusalem was to be trodden down by the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled; implying that at that epoch their captivity is to terminate; and he adds that when that tribulation has ended, they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and shall look up and lift up their heads because their redemption draweth nigh. Matthew xxiv. 21–30; Luke xxi. 24–28.

It is foreshown also Rom. xi. 25–27, where it is announced that the blindness which has happened unto Israel is to continue until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in; and that then all Israel shall be saved by the coming of the Deliverer to Zion, who shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob, according to God's covenant with them when he takes away their sins; indicating that they will then have returned to Zion according to the predictions of the ancient prophets, that their conversion is to take place after their return from their dispersion, Jer. xxxi. 27–40; Zech. xii. 6–14; and that the coming of their Deliverer is thus to be personal and visible.

And finally it is expressly declared by Peter, Acts iii. 19–21, that Christ is to come from heaven at the time of the restoration of the Israelites and the creation of the new heavens and new earth, which are to take place at their re-establishment in their ancient land. "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, *when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ*, who was before preached unto you, WHOM THE HEAVENS MUST RECEIVE [RETAIN] UNTIL THE TIMES OF THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS, *which God hath spoken of by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.*" That restitution of all things is the restoration of the Israelites from their dispersion, their renovation and re-establishment as God's people, the resurrection of the holy dead, the conversion of the Gentiles, the new creation of the earth and the atmosphere by which they are to be reinstated in a condition essentially like that in which they subsisted anterior to the fall; and finally the reign of Jehovah over the earth in visible majesty, for this is the restitution of all things that is spoken of by the holy prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Micah, and others, as we have shown; and is the only restitution of which they speak. And the time when it is to be accomplished, the apostle expressly declares, is that of Christ's return from the heavens to a residence again on earth. His construction of these ancient prophets, therefore, is precisely that which we have put on them; and precludes and confutes the allegorical and mystical sense for which anti-millenarians contend; for the coming of Christ which he foreshows is to take place at the time of the restitution, is indisputably a personal coming. It is to be a coming *from heaven*, where he is to abide until that time. It is to be a coming as the Sent of God, the King to whom the earth is given as a dominion, that he may judge his enemies who have usurped authority over it, deliver his persecuted people, raise his saints who are buried in its dust, convert its living nations, and reign over it and fill it with the beauty and bliss of his salvation through the round of eternal ages. To attempt to force on the passage any other sense is to contradict its natural meaning, and the only meaning it will bear, and convert it into a mere cloud of deceptive words. For if Christ's coming which it predicts is an allegorical act,

then the heaven which he is to leave, the earth to which he is to come, the all things he is to restore, and the Israelites and Gentiles therefore who are to be the subjects of that restitution, are also allegorical;* precisely as in the allegory, Psalm lxxx., the vine being allegorical, its being brought out of Egypt, planted, taking root, sending out its branches to the sea, and covering the hills with its shadow, are likewise allegorical, and represent objects and events of a sphere wholly different from themselves. These allegorical interpreters, therefore, by their construction, get rid not only of the personal coming of Christ, and of the restoration of the Israelites and Gentiles, but of the heaven also which Christ is to leave, and the earth to which he is to come, and all the persons and things which he is to restore, and make a wholly different world and a different set of intelligences the subjects of the restitution. It were an extraordinary weakness to imagine that if Christ's act of coming is allegorical and denotes an action of a different nature, the heavens are not allegorical also which he is to quit, the earth to which he is to come, the restitution he is to achieve, and the inhabitants of the earth also who are used as representatives of the subjects of the predicted restitution, and who must therefore, like the other elements of the allegory, be representatives of a different class of existences. Their construction, in thus emptying the passage of all its natural meaning, and making it relate to some other world and some other order of beings, no one knows who or where, reveals its utter error and folly, and demonstrates that the language involves no such figure, but is to be interpreted in its usual grammatical sense.

We have thus a great array of passages which foreshow, with the utmost clearness, that at the restoration of the Israelites, Jehovah-Christ is to come in person and visible majesty, and deliver them from the power of their enemies, that he is then to re-establish them in their ancient relation as his chosen people, create the heavens and earth anew, and commence an eternal reign over them and the converted Gentiles. This is not simply hinted here and there, or presented in vague and indeterminate terms that admit of another construction. It is a principal theme of nearly all the ancient prophets, and is everywhere exhibited as the great consummation, in which the long rebellion, dispersion, and

captivity of the Israelites, are to terminate. As their first great subject is the enumeration and denunciation of the sins of that people, calls to repentance, warnings of the judgments that awaited them, predictions of their abandonment by God to the hands of their enemies, their conquest, the destruction of their capital, the desolation of their country, their long exile, degradation and misery among the Gentiles, and the vindication of God in inflicting on them those awful punishments; so their other great theme is the promise of their final restoration from captivity, their re-adoption as God's people, the interposition of the Redeemer, in person, to extricate them from the hands of their enemies, the rebuilding and re-peopling of Jerusalem, the re-establishment of God's sanctuary among them, the deliverance of the earth from the curse to which it has been subjected, the reign of Christ over them for ever thereafter, on the throne of David, in glory and majesty. This can no more be struck from those prophecies than the other, or turned from its natural sense to an allegorical meaning. We have no higher certainty that the Israelites are the people whom the prophets designate by that name, reproach and denounce for their offences against God, and foreshow would be conquered by hostile nations, driven into exile, and suffer slaughter, captivity, degradation, and misery, through a long lapse of ages; than we have that they are the people who, the prophets predict, are at length to be recalled from their dispersion, re-constituted a separate people, and re-established in their covenant relations to Jehovah; and that at the time of that restoration, Christ is to come in glory, reveal himself to them as their Messiah and King, destroy the hostile powers that are to be arrayed against them, and creating the heavens and earth anew, reign over them for ever, in the grandeur of the Incarnate Deity. No grosser violation of the word of God was ever perpetrated, than that of which they are guilty who assume that these two great divisions of the prophecies are to be interpreted on wholly different principles. No more astounding hallucination was ever exhibited, than they display, who fancy that such a misconstruction is vindicable by the laws of language.

We shall resume the subject in our next number.

III. The end—its nature and character.

I. What is meant by the gospel being preached in all the world?

We answer: That the knowledge of Jesus Christ and the overtures of the gospel be proclaimed and understood among all nations, so that they do have the opportunity of weighing the question whether they will receive or reject the message. It is plain that the time has never been when this could be affirmed, since Christ was on earth. The apostles travelled far and wide in eastern Asia, Europe, and a small section of Africa; but though they spent their lives in the work, it is evident at the first glance that the ear of only a very small part of the world was gained, even where they were personally present. And they did not go to China, Tartary, India, northern Europe, and central and southern Africa—of course not to the western hemisphere. When the empire was Christianized by Constantine, it was still true that immense regions of the world did not even hear of Christ; the deepest superstition and grossest idolatry continued to prevail, while the empire itself was converted only to a nominal Christianity, and but a small portion probably had the gospel intelligibly propounded to them. Through the dark ages there was descent and not progress in the empire, while the heathen world continued in the same state. At the Reformation, the Roman Catholic church made an onset on China and India, and parts of Africa; but the impression they made was very small in extent, while what they preached hardly deserved the name of gospel. When our missionaries first went to India, in 1812, they issued a tract for circulation at home, entitled "The Claims of Six Hundred Millions," that is, two-thirds of the human race, who were still in Paganism. In no intelligible sense, therefore, can it be said that the gospel has been preached to all nations.

This has indeed been asserted on the ground that, when a missionary plants himself in the midst of a heathen nation, as Gordon Hall in India, or Henry Martyn in Persia, and preaches a few years to as many as he can approach, this is a proclamation of the gospel. And it has even been asserted that the words of Paul, "which [the gospel] is come unto

you *as it is in all the world,*" Col. i. 6, are to be interpreted in such latitude as to mean that in his day the gospel had been preached to all nations. But this is not sober interpretation. Nor can sober men be persuaded that the aggregate of missionary labors as yet is a preaching the gospel to all nations. If we seek for an example in which Christ's true meaning is fulfilled, undoubtedly New England is such. Here the gospel has been long preached to the people. In every city and village and rural district the masses in their individual capacity have come in contact with the gospel. All have the opportunity, if they will embrace it, of hearing the gospel from the pulpit; all, if they please, have the Bible to read, and all do mingle and converse with Christian people; and even those who reject the offers of the gospel and violently oppose, do yet in their opposition manifest their acquaintance with the gospel by the very opposition they make. We would not say that it is necessary for all the world to come into the condition of New England before it could be affirmed with truth that the gospel was preached to all nations, but something proximate, we think, must be the intent of Christ; that the individuals of all nations shall be in a situation to hear or read the message if they will—the name of Jesus, and the offers of salvation through him, must be apprehended so that the message may be intelligently received or rejected. Nor do we say how long the offers of the gospel must be presented to the mind before it can be said the gospel has been preached. We should say the gospel had been fairly presented to the hundred thousand souls of the Sandwich Islands during the last thirty years, so that all the individuals had had opportunity to weigh the question, Will I, or will I not, receive Christ and be saved by him? When all the world has enjoyed the gospel in such a degree, it will be true that the gospel is preached among all nations.

It is worthy of inquiry here, when is it likely the gospel will be preached among all nations to the extent now intimated? It is evident that the prospects, judging from the history of the last fifty years, give promise of this work being accomplished in much shorter time than any previous era has indicated. The present state of India, China, Turkey, and the Pacific Islands, is such as never existed before, and the faci-

lities, by means of the press and navigation by steam, are unprecedented. Let only the same efforts and zeal even be continued for a hundred years, with no more impediments from war than have existed for the last thirty years, and it might be that the offers of the gospel would be fairly presented to the *individuals* of all nations. But God may give to the events of his providence such a turn as shall open doors of access to the gospel for the heathen which shall seem almost miraculous, and secure its accomplishment in a far shorter time. A glimpse of this is now seen in China, where a great political revolution is in progress; and through the ambition and selfishness of man, God may bring about a result which the best appointed efforts of the church seemed inadequate to effect. But of this providential ordering of events we can poorly judge; they are in the future, and we know not either the delays or the accelerations God in his wisdom may design. But,

II. Let us inquire what is meant by the gospel being preached for a witness.

It is a great error to suppose that when the gospel is preached to all nations, all nations—that is, the individuals of all nations—will accept the offers and be saved. Yet the ardent hopes of Christians now prevent them from making the discrimination. If reminded of it to-day, enthusiasm in the missionary work, commendable in itself, makes them forget it to-morrow. But the discrimination should be made, and it should not be forgotten that the gospel preached among all nations is not the same as the gospel received by all nations, that is, received into the heart with saving effect. Contemplate New England. The gospel has been preached two hundred years, and all its individuals have had the offers of salvation through Christ fairly presented to them. This is the fact now. Yet who would venture to say that one half or even one third of those now on the stage, or of those who have died in the last thirty years, did savingly hear and embrace the gospel? The largest charity of those who profess the creeds of the Congregational churches of New England, at least of those who make a credible profession of those creeds, would not embrace so great a proportion as one third. Contemplate Protestant England and Scotland, and a similar picture is presented. Contemplate

the Sandwich Islands—even the twenty-two thousand that have been selected and received into the church, and a sober judgment would hardly ground a hope for half. The missionaries have done as well as they could. Rejecting the principles of Catholics, they have repelled rather than invited admissions. Yet their own account of the character of the converts is such as to lead us to the strong fear that not half are the true children of Christ. They represent them as still very ignorant, frail of purpose, and liable to be turned aside in masses from apparent steadfastness. At the same time, there are unquestionably bright examples of a simple-hearted, genuine piety among them; a great and glorious work has beena ccomplished there, and God has there an invisible church, we do believe, to be numbered by thousands who will be saved.

Now such have been the facts, substantially but variously, ever since the time of the apostles. Wherever the gospel has been preached, some have been truly converted, and some have rejected; but everywhere the rejecters have greatly outnumbered the accepters. In Athens, when Paul preached on Mars Hill, the immense majority turned away in pride and disgust. But a few—Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and certain others with them—believed. At Corinth a much larger proportion believed, and a church was formed.

This general effect of the preaching of the gospel we are led to expect from the parable of the sower. Christ throws the hearers of the gospel into four classes; the soil of three is bad, the seed brings forth no fruit. In only one is the soil propitious. We would not say that Christ means to assert that three fourths will be lost and one fourth saved; but that he meant it as a general account of the reception of the gospel in all the centuries up to the millennium, in which the great majority would reject the gospel, we do say, and facts thus far do confirm the interpretation. The parable of the wheat and tares is more specific and definite. The church itself will be composed, the visible church, of good men and bad men; for it is not in man to search the heart and discriminate; they must both grow together—how long?—till the end of the world, for the harvest in the parable is, in the interpretation, the end of the world. What can be

plainer than that this is to be the character and condition of the visible church to the end of the world? True, Christ does not speak here of proportions, but in his view the proportion of tares must at all times be large, because he represents it dangerous to root them out. Up to this time, if we embrace all that call themselves a Christian church, especially the Roman Catholic and the Greek church, the proportion of tares has been fearfully in the ascendant. Of the whole visible church in New England and Scotland, a candid impartial judgment would make a very large deduction in behalf of tares.

On the basis of these two parables of Christ, interpreted by him, and with admitted facts as to the reception of the gospel by the world, and the mingled character of the church, what ought we to understand by the gospel being preached for a witness to all nations? Their conversion to a new Christianity, not a merely nominal, but a true Christianity? Certainly not. Neither of the parables could be true in such a case, and the fulfilment of the parables for 1800 years in the history of the world and the church gives great confirmation to the position that such will continue to be the case till the end come.

Witness, then, is to be taken in its common acceptation—testimony. When Christ commanded his disciples to go into one city and preach the gospel to them, and they would not receive nor hear them, they were to shake off the dust of their feet as a *witness* against them, and depart out of that to another:—as much as to say, We have declared plainly unto you repentance and salvation through Christ, and you, understanding the message, do intelligently reject it; we have borne testimony for Christ, and you reject the overtures; in witness or testimony that we have discharged the duty laid on us, we do in accordance with ancient custom perform this emblematical act—we shake the dust from our feet. What more obvious than that Christ in Matthew xxiv. repeats the same idea, The gospel of the kingdom must first be preached among all nations for a witness—a testimony for God that he clearly declares man's ruined state, proposes a way of recovery through faith in Christ and repentance unto salvation? The preaching of the gospel is a testimony against wickedness and for judgment to come, a testimony of gra-

cious offers on the part of God for reconciliation. Without this testimony God could not, on the system he has adopted, proceed in the judgment he has revealed to be holden. We might ask, why has he not caused this testimony to be given more rapidly while the generations of the heathen were going down to the grave? But that, like the origin of evil, is among the secret things which belong to God, and cannot be answered but by God.

The gospel then is to be preached as a witness to all nations; whether they will hear and be saved, or reject it and be lost, is not involved necessarily in the declaration. Suppose all the world reject the gospel, as the antediluvian world all rejected the preaching of Noah, and that only a solitary few scattered over the world, one to a nation or tribe, were found to bear witness for God, and that from Christ's time onward to the end none but those preachers should be saved; the conditions of the commission would be satisfied, the gospel would be preached for a witness to all nations.

To know what will actually turn out as the result of preaching the gospel, we must look elsewhere. It is true there are other ends included in the counsels of God as the result of preaching the gospel: facts show it. God manifestly has been gathering in his elect church from Christ's time onward, and we do certainly know that the result is and will be different from the preaching of Noah to his reprobate generation. But we cannot find the guarantee that anything substantially different from the past will occur until the time of the end; we cannot find it in Christ's commission to his disciples, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." That commission is in perfect accordance with Christ's two parables just cited, with his commission to the seventy, and with Matt. xxiv. 14, "And this gospel of the kingdom must first be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations, and then shall the end come." It says nothing about specific results, but generally, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." If that text stood alone, nothing at all could be determined whether all would be saved or all lost; much less could anything be determined as to proportions. Other

passages show clearly enough that the preaching of the gospel will not be without saving effects, and that a vast multitude will be saved through its means; but no passages that we know of, either singly or combined, show that half, or anything like half, of any generation, will savingly receive the gospel message before that time which Christ speaks of as *the end.* Up to that time the gospel is to be preached as a witness with various success.

Again let us look at facts in New England. There are 2,800,000 people. Of the Congregationalists, the largest denomination, there are 164,000 church members; of Baptists, 91,000; of Free Will Baptists, 30,000; of Methodists, 88,000; of Episcopalians, 18,000; of all other denominations say 20,000;* —total 411,000. That makes very nearly one seventh part of the population. We will offset the false professors in the church against truly converted persons out of the church. It is credible to suppose this ratio of one to seven has existed for the last fifty years. But there has been an immense amount of ministerial labor expended, and other means of grace enjoyed in New England during that time. There have been extensive revivals, and the missionary enterprise has grown up within that period; and yet the ratio is but one to seven, and the net increase, by profession, to the Congregational churches in New England for the last few years, is but about 2,000 per year. Moreover, you may find many towns having a population of 2,500 each, where the gospel has been preached with more or less fidelity for thirty years by various denominations, and not one twelfth part are either professors of religion or habitual attendants of public worship. Do not these facts—for we do not believe we are very wide from the truth—go to show that the gospel in the best part of the world is in truth preached for a witness just as Christ said, and not anywise approximating to a saving efficacy, as to masses? In the Sandwich Islands the ratio of professors of religion to non-professors is one to four, and the American Board call the nation converted and passed from their hands. Should the Islands hold their own of native population, and not become extinct as is feared, and should learning and civilization greatly increase, thirty years more would doubt-

* These statistics, except the last, "all other," are from official sources.

less reduce the present ratio so as to be not better than one to seven, like New England, or one to ten. What else can be expected when schism, and conflicting denominations, and the temptations of evil men from abroad shall come in?

Take another illustration—the history of our aborigines now going fast to extinction. The gospel was preached faithfully by Eliott and the Mayhews to the Indians of Massachusetts in the east, and by Edwards and Sargeant to the Stockbridges in the west. So, to the Mohegans in Connecticut, and the Six Nations around Utica. A precious elect were saved from out of them, but alas, how few! The same results are now being experienced in the tribes west of the Mississippi. The Sioux, the Ojibways, the Pottawatomies, the Osages, the Oregon Indians, particularly resist the offers of the gospel,—almost no converts reward the labors of the missionary. It is only among the Choctaws, the Cherokees, and the Senecas, that success is found. And that small success is similar to the success among ourselves. What is it then? To those who hear, it is indeed a savor of life unto life, but to those who refuse it is a witness against them.

In the summer of 1772, the Rev. David McClure and the Rev. Levi Frisbie went on a mission to the Delawares, then inhabiting Ohio, and having their principal town on the banks of the Muskingum. Pittsburgh was then the frontier post; all beyond was unbroken wilderness. Mr. Frisbie fell sick at Pittsburgh, and could not proceed. Mr. McClure pressed on, and was received by the Indians with welcome. Making known his errand, they appointed a council to consider. This council met at intervals for two weeks. Meanwhile the missionary preached to them as often as he could collect an audience. In the evening of a Sabbath after a sermon, "two of the head men," says the narrative, "came to my house and spoke to the following purpose:

"'Brother, when you spoke to us, you told us we must repent of our sins and believe on Jesus Christ; now we should be glad to know what sin is, that we may know what to repent of.'"

On the Thursday following he preached on sin at the council-house, and according to the narrative, "As they had themselves desired me to preach on that subject, I spoke

with freedom, and concealed nothing that I looked upon as belonging to the subject, for fear of being afterward accused by them of misrepresenting the matter. I spoke to them chiefly on external immoralities and sins, which the light of nature and reason condemned; my subject was drawn mainly from the catalogue of sins recorded in the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans; spoke largely on the sin of drunkenness, as that was fresh in their memories (from the riots of the day or two preceding), and on fornication, which I found was shockingly common among them. After sermon I withdrew, and Joseph (his interpreter) tarried with them. One of the council observed to him, that if all those things were sins which I had mentioned, he believed there was no one perfect. And another asked him why I had spoke to him altogether, and told him everything he had been guilty of. One of the council asked me to-day, if there were any more sins besides those I had mentioned; I told him there were many more; well, says he, we would choose to hear them all; and they appointed the next day to hear more on the subject, sin."

He met them the next day, and dwelt particularly on sins of the heart, and that "sins of thought as well as of action were taken notice of by the Great Being, and were displeasing to him." The next day (Saturday) they gave him an opportunity to preach again, and he proceeds, "I spoke with freedom and plainness on the satisfaction of Christ, that it was sufficient for the pardon of all our sins, and insisted on the necessity of repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; several were affected." Joseph tarried and continued the exhortation, insisting "on the certainty of their ruin without religion; and finally told them, unless they received the gospel and lived like white people, God would cut them off, as he had done their forefathers, and give the fine country of the Muskingum, which they now inhabit, to a people that would serve and worship him. They all hung their heads and made no reply. This I thought good Joseph told them with a kind of prophetic spirit, and, if we may argue the future conduct of Divine Providence from the past, is what we may soon see accomplished."

The next day (Sabbath) he preached again, replying to

their standing objection, "that the Christian religion or the Bible was not intended for Indians, but only for the white people." On Monday, "the council sent for me to give me a final answer. After taking a seat, one of the councillors, in the name of the king, delivered the following laconic speech:

"'My brother, I am glad you have come among us from such a great distance, and that we see each other, and rejoice that we have had an opportunity to hear you preach since you have been here. My brother, you will now return home again from whence you came, and when you get there give my love to those that sent you. I have done speaking.'"

This history is instructive, and illustrates the present topic. The missionary went a long and difficult journey to these Delawares to make known the glorious gospel, with kindness and yearnings in his heart. They gave him opportunity to state his errand, he preached to them often, reproving their wickedness, showing the necessity of repentance, and opening to them the way of pardon and salvation through Christ. He followed the great commission. They heard and understood, they took the subject into serious consideration in solemn public council, and came to the deliberate conclusion, "We will not entertain the message; the white man may go home; we will pursue our accustomed practices and belief." This was preaching the gospel for a witness—not, indeed, on the part of the missionary for a witness only, as if he could foresee the result, but with the earnest intent and desire and strong hopes that they would hear and live. In the result, however, it was as a witness only for evil. On them lay the tremendous responsibility of rejecting the overtures of God's grace, and that witness will rise up in the judgment for the condemnation of them and the vindication of God. And so in every case of preaching the gospel to a nation or tribe, it is a witness—sometimes only a witness for evil, but usually both a witness for evil and a witness for good. Yet in no instance in the history of the world has it been the saving instrument to the many of such a nation or tribe, but only to the few.

We reach then this conclusion. The gospel has been preached in the world for eighteen hundred years with just such results as our Saviour implied in Matthew xxiv. and in

the great commission—for a witness—a witness resulting only in evil to the many, a saving instrument but to the few. There have been great fluctuations indeed, alternations of hope and disappointment, success and its absence: in Europe ten centuries of dark ages, and then the Reformation; in New England a great revival in the eighteenth century, and then forty years of adversity; in the nineteenth century several seasons of general refreshing, with corresponding depression succeeding. But through all these ages God has been gathering in his elect, while the gospel has been chiefly a witness in them that are lost. How long will this state of things, this general aspect of the church and the world, continue? We answer unhesitatingly, *until the end;* for that is what Christ declares: "This gospel of the kingdom must first be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and *then* shall the end come." This brings us to the third inquiry.

III. What did our Saviour mean by *the end?*

And here it seems needful to go into a more particular exposition of the chapter. As we said in the outset, the disciples confounded two events, the destruction of Jerusalem, which was to happen in thirty-seven yēars, and his second coming, of which no man or angel knew the time. Jesus therefore discourses of these two events in order. The two events, he would say, are certain, but they are widely separated in time. Take heed in respect to my second coming, that no man deceive you; for in the troubles that shall attend and succeed the destruction of the city, many will come in my name saying, "I am Christ." And for a hundred years afterwards this prophecy was fully verified. The New Testament specifies three such. Theudas with his four hundred, Judas of Galilee, and that Egyptian Jew, "who led away four thousand men that were murderers." And in the general insurrection which the Jews made in the reign of Adrian, fifty or sixty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, for the recovery of their city and liberty, Bar-cochba was a distinguished and formidable false Christ. Our Saviour warns them against all such impostors. He proceeds:

And ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars; the Romans will increase their forces within your borders, Cestius Gallus shall threaten the city with siege, and the Roman

legions shall hover all around. There shall be famines, and earthquakes, and pestilence, in connexion with these wars. All these are the beginning of sorrows. But be not troubled as though these events foreshadowed my immediate coming; for that event, the end of the age, is not yet, is not near at hand. Moreover, ye shall be persecuted and afflicted exceedingly, yea, hated of all nations for my name's sake. There shall be a time of great treachery among brethren, and waxing cold of love. I tell you not how long this state of things shall continue, but in your endurance, possess ye your souls;—he that endureth faithful, the same shall be saved. But I tell you the end of the world and my second coming is not by and by; for the gospel must first be published among all nations, and that, as you may judge, will require a long time. But when this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness to all nations, then shall the end come.

But now, in respect to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, to which the first part of your question relates, I will tell you plainly. There will be clear indications of *that* event, and seasonable—you may know it beforehand. I will mention two things: Jerusalem shall be encompassed with armies, and the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel the prophet shall be set up in the holy place, just as in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes—that is, the image of Jupiter Olympius shall stand on or near the holy ground. When ye shall see all these things, know that the destruction of Jerusalem is nigh. Then, let them that be in Judea flee to the mountains beyond Jordan, and be in haste; let not him that is on the housetop come down to take anything out of the house; let him run from one housetop to another till he reaches the city gates and escapes. For these be the days of vengeance on Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. Wo to delicate and nursing women, and pray that your flight be not in the winter when the roads are difficult, or on the Sabbath when conscience might restrain: for there shall be great distress and wrath on this people, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever shall be. (And the siege of Jerusalem by Titus did exceed in atrocity and distress all precedent; the siege of Saragossa was as nothing in comparison with it.) They shall

fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations, and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. (And the times of the Gentiles are not yet fulfilled.) And except those days of siege should be shortened and the city taken, no flesh, not a soul would be saved—all would perish by famine and slaughter. But for the elect's sake (God had an elect even among them) those days shall be shortened.

Then—he means after this siege and destruction of Jerusalem, all along after, indefinitely—then, if any man shall say unto you, Lo! here is Christ, or there, believe it not. The destruction of Jerusalem is no prelude to my coming; you are mistaken if you think so; not all the horrors of that siege, nor the distress and dispersion consequent, is any prelude to my coming. Be not deceived by any of the great signs and wonders they shall show. If any shall say, Behold, he is in the desert, go not forth; Behold, he is in secret chambers, believe it not. My coming will be known by no such observation- -as that a man should first find my secret abode and then go and tell one, and he another. Far different will be the manner and circumstances of my coming; sudden, unexpected, public, known and read of all men, as the lightning that cometh out of the farthest east, and shineth even unto the farthest west in an instant. So shall the coming of the Son of man be.

Thus far it seems clear what was the leading object of Christ, viz., to separate the question of the disciples. You inquire, he says, when the destruction of the temple and my second coming will occur, as if they would take place at the same time. They will not occur at the same time, a wide interval will separate them. Jerusalem will indeed be destroyed, and that soon; there will be unmistakable signs in the near approach, and though the distress shall be great, it will be but the beginning of sorrows long to be continued. The Jews will be dispersed among all nations, and Jerusalem be trodden down a long while by the Gentiles, till the gospel be preached everywhere, and the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. But my coming will be attended by no *such* signs, nor do I give you the least hint as to the time when—*that*, God has reserved in his own power.

Up to this point, also, it is plain that Christ confined him

self to answering the first part of the disciples' inquiry, When shall the temple be destroyed? But it is equally evident he included more than the destruction of the temple, that he included things consequent on that event. He included the war of Bar-cochba in the reign of Adrian, long, widespread, and in the aggregate more destructive to the Jews than the war of Vespasian and Titus. Adrian slew 500,000 Jews in one campaign, and it is only because there was no Josephus to write its history, that it does not figure as largely as the former war. He included the war of Adrian. He included also the continued dispersion and oppression of the Jews from Titus down to the present time; for the times of the Gentiles are not yet fulfilled, Jerusalem being still trodden down of them.

Now, verse 29, Christ proceeds to answer the second point of their inquiry, and speaks particularly and exclusively of his second advent.

Immediately after the tribulation of those days—not simply the days when the city shall be taken, but of all succeeding days till the cup should be full (and it is not yet full)—immediately after the tribulation of those days, my second advent shall take place. And these shall be the signs: the sun shall be darkened, the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken:—meaning, as we think, not moral and political convulsions simply, but great natural convulsions which shall arrest the attention of the universal world at once. And then shall appear the distinctive sign of the Son of man, the harbinger of his immediate approach. He does not tell what that distinctive sign will be, but unquestionably something worthy of the occasion and the scene; for it is added, Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn. And it is further said, And then shall they *see* the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory. And he shall send forth his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from the one end of heaven to the other.

This passage we say is Christ's answer to the second part of the disciples' inquiry. The first was, When shall the temple be destroyed? and the answer is, Soon—when ye shall see Jerusalem encompassed with armies and the hea-

then gods set up. This in fact took place in thirty-seven years. But Christ declared this was only the beginning of sorrows—they would last a great while. The second part of the inquiry was, When shall the second coming be, and what its sign? The answer to this is in the passage just cited (verses 29–31)—Immediately after the long troubles of which Jerusalem's capture was the beginning. To refer this passage wholly to the capture of the city,—to refer its accompaniments, and especially the gathering of his elect from the four winds of heaven, seems as trifling as it is discordant with the main drift and object of Christ; which is to make his disciples *distinguish* between the destruction of the city and temple and his second coming.

Having discoursed thus far of the two events, our Saviour might perhaps have left the subject; but knowing the tenacity with which they held on to the prejudice that the two events were conjoined in time, he repeats, HE GOES OVER THE SAME GROUND AGAIN, presenting the subject more concisely and in more striking contrast, confining himself first, as before, to the former part of the inquiry, the destruction of Jerusalem—thus:

As to the destruction of the temple and its signs, be instructed by an illustration from the fig-tree. When his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise, when ye see all these things, viz. Jerusalem encompassed with armies, and the abominable image of Jupiter standing near the holy place, know that *it*—the destruction of the temple—is nigh, even at the doors. And it is absolutely so nigh that, verily, this generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled. Thus precisely do I tell you when the temple shall be destroyed. And he adds the solemn asseveration, Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away, they are certain truth. Now for the antithesis, the repetition of the answer to the second part of the inquiry.

But of THAT day and hour—when the Son of man shall come the second time—knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but the Father only.

That the phrase *that day* is idiomatic, and was appropriated by the New Testament writers to the second advent, is plain. Matt. vii. 22: "Many will say unto me in *that day*, Lord,

Lord," etc. 2 Tim. i. 12: "And am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against *that day*." 2 Tim. i. 18: "The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in *that day*." 2 Tim. iv. 8: "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at *that day*, and not to me only, but unto all them that love *his appearing*." In this last place the terms *that day* and *his appearing* are interchanged, one interprets the other,—of course limits the meaning of *that day* to the second advent. Our Saviour uses it in the same way: "But of *that day* . . . knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." He goes on to say, that neither when it comes will men have any warning, as in the destruction of the city, by signs; that is, signs that shall continue for any length of time, as a year or a month, or for days. But it shall come on them suddenly, unexpectedly, as a snare, in an hour when they are not aware, as the flood came on the old world: they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the very *day* Noah entered the ark; and *knew* not till the flood came and took them all away. "*So* shall also the coming of the Son of man be." He closes with a prolonged and varied exhortation to watch for this event, on the ground of its suddenness and their utter ignorance of the time when. "For ye know not at what hour your Lord doth come." "For in such an hour as ye think not the Son of man cometh." The three succeeding parables—the unfaithful servant, the ten virgins, the talents, and the thrilling statement of the facts of the succeeding judgment—are all a part of this exhortation.

Such is our view of the scope and details of the chapter; and if the view is correct, it answers the inquiry, What did Christ mean in the words, "and then shall the end come?" It means his second advent, the end of this current age, or economy, or dispensation, and the introduction of a new. Not by any means the end of the world in the common acceptation of that phrase—the annihilation of the planet, or the terminus of the generations of men. When the disciples ask, What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world? the Greek word is αἰών; and when Christ gives the answer, "and then shall the end come," although

the word αἰων is not expressed after τελος, it is manifestly to be supplied. But αἰων is admitted by all commentators to have frequently the sense of *age*, and seldom the meaning of οἰκουμενη, habitable earth, or of κοσμος, world or planet. The disciples had no such idea as our common idea, *end* of the planet, or consummation of the human race. Neither did they after they became apostles, and had their views corrected as to the character of Christ's kingdom. They expected the generations of men would go on after Christ's second advent, and that he would reign over them on this earth. The idea that συντελεια του αἰωνος means annihilation of the planet, or such convulsion by fire as to render it ever after uninhabitable, ought to be dismissed. It means *end of this age.* So Christ used it in our passage.

From this discussion the following things may be inferred:

1. We are not to expect the world will be converted until the time of the end.

Our Saviour, in reply to the first part of the disciples' inquiry, describes a period of great length—a period of great distress to the Jewish nation, and of depression and struggling to Christians. He calls it the times of the Gentiles, which the connexion shows to mean, times when the Gentiles shall bear rule over the Jews and tread down their city, and when also the gospel shall be preached to the Gentiles. And when he says the gospel must be preached to all nations for a witness, he manifestly does not say they shall all be converted, or that all of any generation shall be converted during that period, but on the contrary, implies that this will not be so,—that the majority will reject the offer. This is shown by the commission to the seventy, compared with the results of their preaching, and the facts of every age since. The past is the interpreter of the future until the end come. It cannot be argued from the nature of the gospel, with the facts of human depravity before us, that things will be essentially different in the future until the end come; nor from the occasional extraordinary success of the gospel along the centuries. Such alternations of prosperity and adversity are to be expected, but give no ground to hope for the conversion of the world within that period limited by *the end.* The present remarkable openings in Divine Providence to

the heathen world, for example China, give no ground for such hope; for should the whole heathen world be raised to the present condition of New England, it would be but a nominal conversion of the majority, not a real conversion involving change of heart and individual salvation. Our Saviour speaks of this period as that of the elect: he will send forth his angels, and they shall gather his *elect* from the four winds of heaven. The course of Providence, and the teachings of the New Testament, evidently point out this period as the period of saving an elect and not a universal church. The gospel will be a saving instrument to some, a mere witness *against* others, through the period. No doubt the number of the saved in a given time will be larger by far as the gospel is published more extensively; we have reason to believe God has reserved the greatest harvest of the elect for the last generations of the period. But it will be an elect number, not at any time, as we think, amounting to a majority of any one generation.

2. This view of the subject presents the true ground of encouragement for ministers and all the people of God to labor in his vineyard. Christ says this gospel of the kingdom *must* be preached in all the world to all nations before the end shall come. By whom? Of course by his disciples; he will send no angels from heaven to do it. Hence his commission, "Go *ye* into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." It is then our imperious duty, and should be our highest privilege, though blind to specific results. Does he say in that commission that at any period all, or a majority, or even any, shall believe? Not at all, but go and preach; he says nothing about specific results, but only conditional. Is not this encouragement, and the true encouragement? Surely it was Noah's and Elijah's, for the one saw no conversions and the other almost none, though God showed him more than he supposed. It will be a fearful omen for the church and the world when God's ministers shall begin to say, I will not preach the gospel unless I have the assurance of visible success in the conversion of souls. Suppose it revealed to a minister, You shall preach all your life in a given place, and not an individual shall hear your message, but all shall be lost; nevertheless preach. Would he take the fearful responsibility of saying, I will not

testify for God in such discouraging circumstances? Not if he were a true disciple, and regarded the authority of God. Visible present success is indeed pleasant, stimulating, encouraging; but it should be viewed as a matter of grace and not of debt. God calls his ministers often to labors in *discouraging* circumstances, yea to human view hopeless as to conversions. But God has other ends to subserve by the testimony for him. Shall not the minister labor for those other ends, whatever they may be? If they are God's ends they are glorious, and the servant will be a sweet savor unto God though all his hearers be lost. So in respect to the universal church now active, it would be just as much their duty to send the gospel to China, India, and Africa, and to labor to disenthrall manacled Papists, if it were revealed from heaven that none should be converted. Far off be the time when the American Board shall say, There are no fruits of our labors, let us now disband. The true ground of encouragement is the command of Christ, with thankfulness for any degree of success while the militant state endures, that is, till the end come. On the contrary, it is a false ground of encouragement and will work injurious consequences to hold up the view opposed to the principles here advocated; to insist that the world will be truly converted by the preaching of the gospel *before* the end come. For instance, there is now a great opening in China—a surprising revolution in progress, with Christianity for its moving power. When one says in a popular assembly, as we read in a newspaper report of a speech recently made, "China has been converted to its present state by a single tract, and in a few years it will be wholly converted to Christ;" it is misleading the popular assembly, and sowing the seeds of a painful reaction when the disappointment comes. For come it will. China will not be converted to Christ in the time and way asserted, unless we wholly misapprehend the New Testament in general, and Matt. xxiv. in particular. It may be nominally converted; we believe it will be. It may be that sixty millions of its three hundred millions will be truly converted; for this we earnestly hope and pray. But what then? The God of this world would still have the ascendency, and the principles here advocated hold true, unless anticipated by the *end being come.* Not long since we heard the Secretary of one of our

Home Missionary Societies preach a sermon, in which he labored to prove that the United States is a godless nation; that New England is a godless people; and if so, how much more the rest of the world. He was right substantially; the god of this world, Satan, *has* the ascendency in New England, and will have till the end come. To assert the contrary is presenting false encouragement, doomed to reaction and disappointment.

There is another ground of true encouragement which is commonly overlooked. It is the purpose of God, we will suppose, to carry this world, or rather the church, through this long conflict and depression, with the design of gathering an elect church, small though it be in comparison with the sum total of the generations, with ulterior objects beyond the time of the end, in a succeeding æon, so glorious that the glory of the current period hath no glory by reason of the glory that excelleth. But his plan is such that this glorious period cannot be introduced until that elect is gathered in; till the very last name is registered as saved. In gathering in this elect church, he ordains the preaching of the gospel in the circumstances we see as a means. Every sermon, every charity, every example of piety, every testimony for God contributes to the grand issue of gathering in that elect; to make the destined number whole; every such agency hastens that issue. It is our lot to be born and live in this period, and help God accomplish this part of his great plan, which is but preliminary to a greater, and without which that greater could not be. To hasten the accomplishment of this work, and of course to hasten the introduction of the more glorious, shall we not labor? Is there not encouragement whatever be the vicissitudes and difficulties? Who are we, to rise up and say, "Lord, we do not wish to live and labor in this preliminary work; the god of this world in every age having the ascendency, why didst thou not defer our creation till the millennial age?" This is not the martyr spirit; it is neither submission, nor faith, nor hope, nor charity which endureth all things. Such forget the exhortation of the glorified Redeemer through his servant John; "But that which thou hast (the burdens?) hold fast till I come. And he that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the

nations;" he shall yet live in the millennial age and have work to do there. What we have just stated as hypothetical—that the present period of conflict is preliminary to the triumphant, necessary to it, and that labor in this hastens on the coming of that—we believe to be absolutely certain. It is the great plan of the great God. To coöperate with him is the true ground of encouragement.

3. We infer that when the gospel shall be thus preached, and the end shall have come, then will the millennium which the prophets, Christ, and the apostles have predicted, begin; and not before. Christ does not say this expressly in Matt. xxiv. 14, but it follows directly from the nature of the case, from the considerations that have been adduced; and it is the essential idea of his coming. To discuss the principles of prophetic interpretation is inconsistent with these limits. Suffice it then to assert, that the prophets describe a state of things yet future, wholly incompatible with the present constitution of the world, and at total variance with Christ's declared object in respect to the preaching of the gospel and the effects it will produce. Now, if that predicted state of things has not existed, and cannot until his coming, it must after; for the word of God is sure, it cannot fail. And here we beg it may be considered what is the proper idea of the term *millennium*. Is it a suffering militant state of the church, where six sevenths even of New England are without its pale, without hope and without God in the world? where the god of this world has such ascendency, that not only is the church in conflict with the world at such fearful odds, but in conflict with itself, so that controversy on what the Bible teaches is well denominated "The conflict of ages;" and which a recent writer from our own ranks says, cannot be settled without removing the sin of each one of us back to a pre-existent state? Is it when a bare majority of the race shall be on the side of Christ in heart, so that godliness shall have the decided ascendency, overawing and restraining open opposition? No, this is not the proper idea of the term millennium, but "Thy people shall be all righteous." "The days of thy mourning shall be ended." *All* Israel shall be saved, and *all* the Gentiles; Christ shall reign over the nations *as* over saints. Satan shall not go forth any more to deceive the nations. Is not this wholly incompatible with Christ's declaration, that the gospel must be *first*

preached to all men for a witness, when some will hear and some reject the message? And yet the time must come when all will hear and be saved. That time is after *the end*, and the end is Christ's second advent, the end of one αἰών, the beginning of another. Is it still asked, Why may not this change be accomplished by the present modes of preaching the gospel, attended by greater outpourings of the Spirit, without the intervention of Christ's advent? We reply, just because Christ says it shall not. "This gospel must first be published to all nations for a witness, and then shall the end come." When beyond this we ask, Why? it is to counsel God and not be counselled of him. Enough that he has so ordained, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." It is also inquired, triumphantly, often, Will God use any means *after* the end for the conversion of the world other than the preaching of the gospel, and the agency of the Holy Spirit? and, if not, what need of the advent? Not to reply as before, God ordains it thus, it may be added, that, when more light shall beam forth from God's holy word, assisted by the stupendous scenes of the great appearing, the resurrection of the saints openly justified and glorified, and—a thing not incredible—when new revelations shall be given, whether written or oral, such efficiency will be exerted by the Holy Spirit as accords with effects so great as the true conversion of the world. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power." The day of God's power, his great power, is not now, and will not be, we repeat it, until the end come. Meanwhile the Spirit and bride say Ἔρχου, come *thou* Lord Jesus, and let him that heareth say Ἔρχου, come thou Lord Jesus. Even so, do we repeat, Lord Jesus, come quickly. Amen.

ART. III.—THE CONFLICT OF AGES; Or, The Great Debate on the Moral Relations of God and Man. By Edward Beecher, D.D. Boston: Phillips, Sampson & Co. 1853.

BY THE EDITOR.

ALMOST all the great errors and corruptions with which the religion of the Bible has had to contend, have had their

origin in the bosom of the church itself. Though the idolatry to which the ancient Israelites apostatized was copied from other nations, yet it was their princes and priests who first adopted it, and by their example and authority diffused it among the people. And in like manner, though the image and saint-worship into which the Christian communion was betrayed in its early ages was drawn from the Paganism that had long reigned in the Greek and Roman worlds, yet it was the monarchs who assumed the Christian name, and the teachers of the sacred word, who first intruded it into the church, and incorporated it with the worship and rites instituted by Christ. Nearly all the other great errors that have disfigured and distracted the Christian world, have had their parentage and nurture in the church itself. It is her teachers who have been her great corrupters; it is the shepherds who have led the flock out of its green pastures and from beside its still waters, into deserts and wildernesses, where it has perished from hunger and thirst, or fallen a prey to wild beasts. They have themselves been the wolves and tigers who have slaughtered and devoured it. And among those who have exerted this disastrous agency, there have been not a few probably who were very little aware of the true nature of their false doctrines; who persuaded themselves, indeed, that their fatal perversions of Christianity were important evolutions of its truth; and that, in the blows which they struck at its very existence, they were employed only in beating down its foes, and in fortifying it against assault.

And such is the character, we think, of the work we are about to criticise. However sincere its author may be in his conviction of the accuracy and importance of the views he advances, and how ingenuous soever and earnest he may be in his desire to correct what he regards as errors, and unfold the great measures of the divine administration in their true character, and vindicate them from objection,—the hypothesis which he advances for that purpose is altogether erroneous; many of the main principles on which he proceeds, instead of having any sanction from the word of God, are fraught with the subversion of the Christian system; and thence, in place of subserving the interests of truth and piety, the scheme is fitted to prove the means of unbelief,

scepticism, and false faith, very much in proportion as it is accepted and followed to its natural results.

He founds his work on a persuasion that "a traditional misadjustment has been introduced into the current system of Christianity," by which "the main moving powers of the system have been made from age to age to work against each other," and intercept it in a large measure from the salutary influences it would otherwise exert. "The main moving powers of the current Christianity," he holds, are, 1. The doctrine respecting "the fallen and ruined condition of man as a sinner;" and 2. The doctrine respecting "the justice and benevolence of God in his dealings with man." To the doctrine generally held by the Protestant churches respecting the fallen condition of the race, he assents in the fullest and most emphatic manner. But he holds that the views that are commonly entertained of the means through which they were brought into this condition — though drawn from the Bible—are wholly mistaken and irreconcilable with God's justice and benevolence, exhibit man as the victim of an arbitrary and remorseless, rather than the subject of a righteous and gracious sovereign, and force the mind, by the very necessities of its moral nature, to resist and hate the government which God is exercising over it. And this "misadjustment" he proposes to remedy, by introducing into the system the doctrine of man's pre-existence in another world, and apostasy there, in a condition that devolves the blame altogether on himself, and frees God from all obnoxiousness to a charge of malevolence or injustice in bringing him into existence here in his present disadvantageous state. These are the great points which he labors to maintain, and he urges them, if not with much effect, at least with an uncommon degree of earnestness and enthusiasm, and flatters himself that should they be adopted, Christianity will gain thereby a new and resistless power, and advance at once with a speedy step to the conquest of the world. His discussion is extended to a very unreasonable length. An unnecessary display is made of short chapters on minute parts of the subject. He redefines, repeats, and recapitulates to weariness, and conducts his reader through a needless and bewildering series of marches and countermarches, before leading him to the point from which the new doctrine

is disclosed to his view. It is, however, written in a clear and vivacious style, is marked by good temper, and leaves the impression, that it is the work of an earnest though not a far seeing and well balanced mind. So far, indeed, from having mastered the subject, many of his main views are extremely superficial and self-contradictory. The objections he alleges against the doctrine of the Scriptures respecting the creation and fall of man, are altogether unfounded and injurious to God; and the hypothesis on which he relies to remove them, is not only gratuitous, mistaken, and unadapted to the end for which he employs it, but would expose the divine procedure to the most unanswerable and fatal objections.

We shall, accordingly, make it our business first to indicate some of the doctrines of his theory which are but partially developed by him, that not only show it to be utterly erroneous, but make it probable that so far from fully understanding it, he is but imperfectly aware of the ground on which he proceeds, or the points he should have settled, in order to accomplish the object at which he aims. Next, we shall show that his hypothesis is altogether undemonstrated; against both the teachings of the Bible and the voice of consciousness; and, if admitted, instead of furnishing any vindication of the Most High, would expose him to the charge of infinite deception and injustice. And finally, we shall endeavor to prove that the assumption on which he predicates the necessity of such an hypothesis—that, on the supposition that man commences his being in this life, God's administration over him is unbenevolent and unjust,—is a most causeless and injurious impeachment of his procedure.

I. The author, it will generally be felt, we think, is injudiciously pretentious. An air is everywhere assumed of the most thorough and comprehensive investigation. Great attempts are made to exaggerate the importance of the question. The profession is incessantly reiterated, that it is to be tried by the indubitable tests of consciousness, honor, and revelation. The reader is continually reminded of the necessity of pausing at all the preliminary topics which the author discusses, and catching precisely that view of them which he presents, in order to a just understanding of the subject. The feeling is uttered at almost every step, that it

is the greatest theme that ever engaged the attention of men; the fate of the universe is exhibited as suspended on it; yet, though it is represented as having heretofore baffled the greatest intellects, the utmost assurance is expressed that its difficulties are all now solved, and his readers are in effect told scores of times, that unless his explanation is the true one, the government of the Most High is indisputably incapable of vindication, and can only be contemplated with dismay and horror, as an infinite complication of folly and malevolence.—P. 489–491. We do not disapprove of his earnestness. We have no objection to his treating the subject as one of great moment. But we do object in the most emphatic manner to his arraigning the Infinite One, as it seems to us he does, at the bar of his intellect, and presuming, on the ground that he has thoroughly scanned the subject, to assert that, if the course of events has not been such as his hypothesis contemplates, no justification is possible of the Most High: and the interests of truth we think require, in order that a just estimate may be formed of the worth of his opinions, that before proceeding to the discussion of his main doctrine, it should be shown that, instead of having mastered the subject, the most decisive indications appear on every hand that he has caught but a superficial view of it; that he is apparently altogether unaware of the bearing on it of some of the most important of the positions which he advances, and that a number of points are left untouched by him, the determination of which is necessary to the validity of his argument.

1. He seems then, to us, to betray a very unfortunate confusion of ideas in the exhibition of the doctrine of the fallen condition of man, and the justice of the divine dealings towards him, as the two "main moving powers" of Christianity, and representing that they counteract each other as the wheels of a steamboat would, if so adjusted as to turn in opposite directions, and cause the vessel, instead of advancing, to revolve in a circle. The fallen condition of man, or the doctrine respecting it, is not one of the moving powers of Christianity. It is the great fact or truth in which Christianity has its necessity and ground. The alienation and condemnation of men are the evils which it is the design of Christianity *to overcome and remove:* not the power by which

they are to *be* removed: as the resistance presented by the water is the obstacle which the machinery of the steamboat is to overcome, not itself the power by which it is to be overcome, and the boat impelled forward. Neither is the justice of God in his dealings with men, one of "the main moving-powers" of Christianity. Instead, it is the great fact on which Christianity is based. It is because God's dealings with men are just; because he has the rights which he asserts in his law, and may with rectitude inflict the penalty of its violation, that he has instituted the gracious method of deliverance which Christianity announces; and the moving powers of the system are the great facts and truths of that method, as they are taught in the Sacred Word, and enforced by the Almighty Spirit. He thus confounds the lost condition of men with the merciful means by which they are delivered from that condition: and the justice of God in dealing with them as the subjects of law, with the gracious instruments and influences which he employs, in recalling them from their revolt, and releasing them from the penalty which the law assigns them. These errors are not, indeed, of fundamental moment, though they cast their shadow over his whole discussion. They exemplify, however, a want of accurate discrimination, and of a clear comprehension of himself, which appears in every part of his volume.

He falls into an error also in representing, as he does, that the difficulties which men feel on these subjects are the great obstacles by which they are withheld from accepting Christianity and embracing its salvation. It is their alienation itself from God that is the great obstacle to be overcome; not their perplexities about the cause or manner of their becoming thus alienated. The latter may be removed, and yet the former still remain, and reign with undiminished and perhaps augmented energy. Nor is it from these subjects exclusively that the influences emanate by which men are led to reject other great doctrines of the Bible. So far from it, false notions of the nature of the will have probably proved a more fruitful source of great doctrinal errors than any other. Dr. B. is aware that the party in New England who, thirty years ago, adopted the theory of the independence or self-determination of the will, and attempted,

on the ground of it, to account for the introduction of sin into the world, were led by their speculations not only to reject the doctrines of foreknowledge, sovereignty, election, and perseverance, but to deny the possibility of proving that God can renew the mind by his Spirit, or exert any influence on it,—without destroying its moral powers,—by which it will in any instance be prevented from sin; and thereby not merely treated the doctrine of depravity as of no significance, —for if men exert their volitions without any conscious reasons, without any impulse from either their intellect or affections, by a mere blind exertion of power, of what consideration can it be whether they are held to be depraved or not? their moral state can have no influence on their agency—but overturned the whole Christian system. If God cannot renew nor influence the mind, he plainly cannot confer such a salvation as Christ came to accomplish, and the whole representation presented by the Scriptures of the work of redemption is erroneous and deceptive. These will serve as specimens of the confusion of ideas which he sometimes betrays, and of the exaggerations into which he runs in his estimate of the place which his subject holds in the great system of theology.

2. The error into which he falls in representing that God suffers sorrow, pain, or misery, and immeasurably, because of the sin of his creatures—is of a still graver character, and would, if admitted, shroud the divine perfections in a cloud of darkness, and fill the universe with gloom. He says:

"If anything is prominent and uncontradicted in the Bible, it is the great doctrine that the entrance of evil has involved *a period of long-continued suffering to God.* Indeed, it is the grand characteristic of the present system, that all the glorious results to which God is conducting the universal system, have been purchased at the expense of *his own long-continued and patiently-endured sufferings.* In this he gives to the universe the highest possible proof of pure, disinterested, and self-sacrificing love."—P. 487.

"It alone leads," he says of his theory, "to such an understanding of the doctrine of future eternal punishments, *as, connected with the previous suffering of God,* shall properly throw the moral sympathies of all holy minds on the side of God, and put an end to that reaction which tends so fatally to destroy the true and indispensable power of that doctrine."—Pp. 490, 491.

But how is this doctrine, that God suffers an immeasurable sum of sorrow or pain, and the satisfaction with which Dr. B. contemplates it, to be reconciled with the representation he frequently repeats, and on which he builds a large portion of his reasonings, that moral beings are bound by justice and benevolence to desire the perfect well-being of others, and regard their subjection to evil with instinctive and irrepressible abhorrence? If his representation is true, the sufferings, the miseries of God, are not only immense, but no probable or conceivable limit can be set to them. For, on Dr. B.'s theory, there are no means of knowing or conjecturing how extensively sin prevails in the universe. Not only, according to him, have as many spirits fallen in another world as have hitherto lived in this, but as many as shall hereafter have a being here; and therefore, as the race is to dwell here and multiply for ever, they must amount to innumerable millions. There is no knowing, indeed, on the ground on which he proceeds, that their numbers are not to be incalculably greater than the human family is ever to embrace, and enough to constitute millions of such endlessly multiplying races. That, indeed, is the conclusion to which his representations lead: for as he holds, as we shall see, that the material universe was created *after* the fall of pure spirits, and in order to their being brought into a new existence in a bodied state, it follows that their numbers must be presumed to be sufficient to people the whole universe of material worlds, and is therefore immeasurably beyond our powers of comprehension. The suffering then, the sorrow, the horror of God at the spectacle, must, according to Dr. B., be great in proportion to the evil; must be commensurate, indeed, with the immensity of his attributes; and therefore, to the thoughts of creatures, be absolutely infinite. But, if the suffering of God is thus infinite, that fact and its cause must prove the occasion most surely of equal suffering, in proportion to their nature, to all his holy creatures. The whole holy universe must thus be regarded, according to Dr. B., as plunged in an unfathomable abyss of wretchedness. Can a more irrational, a more anti-scriptural, or a more gloomy and revolting conception be framed of God and his holy creatures?

How now is Dr. B.'s joy at the suffering he thus ascribes

to the Most High as infinitely glorious to him, to be reconciled with the representation on which he builds a large part of his speculations and reasonings, that honor, justice, and benevolence prohibit a moral being from contemplating the subjection of others to evil, either with complacency or indifference? If bound, as he maintains, to look at evil, wherever it exists, with instinctive and irrepressible horror, it is impossible that a benevolent being can contemplate such an infinite sum in God himself and his holy creatures, but with the keenest grief—with immeasurable and inconsolable anguish. The thought of happiness in such a universe would be wholly revolting to such a mind. It would be impossible, without an utter extinction of every benignant and sympathetic feeling; without a brutal insensibility.

This branch of his theory exhibits God, therefore, as infinitely imperfect. For, is the wretchedness which Dr. B.'s theory ascribes to the Most High to continue for ever, or is it to pass away? He seems to intimate that it is to be of but a limited duration: for he represents "the entrance of evil" as involving a "*period of long* continued suffering to God;" and "the glorious results to which God is conducting the universal system," as having "been purchased at the expense of his own *long continued* and patiently endured sufferings."—P. 487. But, if omniscient, if embracing at each moment in his all-comprehending glance, with equal vividness, the past, the present, and the future, how can his sufferings be supposed to cease? If the sight and sense of the evil that now exists fill him with immeasurable grief and horror, why should not the equally perfect sight and sense of them at all other times occasion an equal measure of anguish? How can his suffering be conceived to cease, unless it be by the removal from his mind of the objects that cause it;—that is, by their ceasing to be objects of his attention? But that implies that he is not all-seeing and all-comprehending; that his views are circumscribed and partial; that his thoughts, therefore, are transient and successive, and thence are occupied, like those of creatures, mainly by the present. But that is to suppose him infinitely imperfect, and inadequate to the government of the world which he has called into being: for if his nature is such that the rebellion and misery of his creatures may pass from his

thoughts; if he is capable of forgetting such a momentous portion of the past, who can be sure that he retains such a recollection of the conduct of his creatures as to be able to treat them according to their true characters? Who can be certain that he may not overlook the obedience of the righteous as well as the sins of the wicked, and assign them rewards that are altogether at war with their deserts? Dr. B.'s notion thus directly detracts from the Most High the very perfections which it is its professed object to verify, and renders him obnoxious to the doubts and suspicions, in an infinite measure, from which he is endeavoring to shield him.

If, on the other hand, Dr. B., rejecting this derogatory notion of God, holds that he is omniscient, embracing in his view at all times, with equal vividness, the past, the present, and the future, and contemplating them with the same emotions; and admits, therefore, that if the evil that has existed, and now exists, renders him immeasurably unhappy, it must necessarily continue to be an equal source of grief and horror to him, through his unending being, and that his holy creatures must also be made equally wretched by it through their immortal existence; then how can he reconcile the creation and upholding of such a universe with the wisdom and benevolence of God! a universe in which, by the supposition, every intelligent being, without a solitary exception, is to be immeasurably wretched—the incorrigibly wicked, by the actings of conscience and the suffering of penal inflictions; God, and all his holy creatures, by the sight and sense of the sin that has been and is committed, and the miseries it engenders! Can a grosser self-contradiction be conceived than the supposition that such a system can be the work of goodness and wisdom? Could Dr. B. have framed a notion more utterly irreconcilable with the views on which he builds the whole fabric of his volume, respecting the course which "honor, justice, and equity" require that the Most High should pursue in the creation and government of the universe? Is it to be believed he would have plunged into this gulf of errors, had he been aware of the consequences to which his supposition that God is an infinite sufferer leads? Is it not clear that he is undertaking to deal with subjects that lie beyond the scope of his vision;

that he is attempting to sound a depth that altogether exceeds the length of his line?

3. He appears, in like manner, not to have seen the results to which his doctrine leads, that God is not able by any means in his power to prevent beings in the early ages of the universe from falling into sin.

He rejects the doctrine, "that God has absolute and unlimited power at all times to secure universal holiness if he will;" and asserts "a *temporary* limitation of divine power in the earlier stages of creation, in consequence of the liability of finite minds to unbelief and distrust of God, when exposed to the trials which inevitably pertain to an infinite system, and which are necessary to their own development and perfection"—P. 509,—"A temporary limitation of divine power originating from the limitation of finite capacities to comprehend God and his ways, and a consequent liability in the first generations of creatures to unbelief, distrust, and sin, involving a season of suffering in God, and requiring a full unfolding of truth in act, until God and his system shall be fully disclosed, and the occasion of unbelief cease."—P. 477.

But how is this to be reconciled with the doctrine which he makes the basis of his whole work, that God is bound in honor, justice, and benevolence to place new-created beings in conditions in which there is a decided overbalance of influences and tendencies to obedience, instead of sin? He says:

"The principles of honor and of right, with respect to new-created beings, we have shown . . . demand that God shall give to all new-created beings original constitutions, healthy and well balanced, and tending *decidedly* and EFFECTUALLY towards good. To make them either neutral, or with constitutions tending to sin, would be utterly inconsistent with the honor and justice of God, and would involve him in the guilt and dishonor of sin. Moreover, God is bound to place new-created things [beings] in such circumstances that there shall be an overbalance of influences and tendencies on the side of holiness, and not of sin."—P. 214.

According to his doctrine, however, of a limitation of the divine power in the early stages of creation, God not only has not done this, but it was not possible to him, with all

the resources of his omnipotence and omniscience, to place beings in conditions in which there should not be an inevitable prevalence of temptations to unbelief, distrust, and sin. His procedure, if Dr. B.'s views are correct, has been in direct contravention of the obligations of honor and equity. His inability to prevent his creatures from successful temptations to sin, should, on the ground Dr. B. occupies, have withheld him from giving them existence. It follows, therefore, according to him, that in creating them in circumstances where they were inevitably exposed to such an immeasurable evil, he violated the dictates of justice and benevolence, and is unworthy, consequently, of the love and homage of his subjects, as a wise, just, and good being. Dr. B.'s notions on this subject thus involve the denial of the very perfections to God which it is his professed object in his volume to vindicate.

But how, without detracting from the perfections of the Most High, can Dr. B. deny his power to make such a manifestation of himself to new-created beings, as to prevent them from sinning? Cannot he who forms the mind, convey to it a true knowledge of himself? Are new-created beings inaccessible to him? Cannot he manifest to them his being, his relations as creator, his agency as upholder and benefactor, and his rights as lawgiver, and cause them to see that his character is what it is? No one surely can deny it, without denying all his divine attributes, and accusing him of infinite presumption in giving existence to such creatures, and infinite injustice in requiring them to recognise and honor him as being what he is. For how can he be justified in giving existence to moral beings who, when in the maturity of their powers, and after being put under law, are incapable, from their nature, of comprehending or knowing anything of the relations in which they are called to act? How can he be vindicated in requiring creatures to love and obey him, when, by the supposition, it is impossible to him, with all his power and wisdom, to enable them to see and know who and what he is, whom they are required to love and serve?

If, to escape this embarrassment, Dr. B. should admit that God can convey true views of himself to new-created beings, and yet should continue to maintain that he could not thereby prevent them from sinning, he is still involved in equal

difficulties: for it would imply either that the character of God is such that a new-created and unfallen being could not possibly love him, and because it is necessarily unlovable to an unfallen being—which is to deny his rectitude and benevolence; or else, that the nature of a new-created and unfallen being is such that he cannot possibly love God because of his infinite sanctitude, benevolence, and wisdom—which is to represent that God creates moral beings with a nature that necessarily prompts them to sin; and in either case, therefore, contradicts the doctrine which he makes the great basis of his whole argument, that God is bound by the principles of honor and justice to give new-created beings a nature that decidedly and effectually predisposes them to obedience.

But, finally—passing from these difficulties—how, on Dr. B.'s theory, could the Most High gain any such accessions to his power, by "a full unfolding of truth in act," as to enable him to overcome the temptations to unbelief, and cause creatures to yield a spotless obedience? What are the great facts of his nature and government which, according to Dr. B.'s theory, would first be thus unfolded? Not, as he assumes, his infinite perfections: not his omnipotence, his immeasurable wisdom, his boundless benevolence; but, instead, the direct opposites. The first great fact that would be disclosed to them would be, that he had formed them with such a proclivity to sin, that he could not, with all the resources of his power and intelligence, prevent them from committing it. The next would be, that, in contravention of the dictates of honor, justice, and benevolence, he had placed them in conditions in which they were borne by a resistless impulse of temptation to the perpetration of evil. And the third would be, that in thus creating and dealing with them, he subjected himself and all his holy creatures to unutterable and eternal misery; and therefore, that he is altogether inadequate to the work he has undertaken, of forming and governing the universe; defective in strength, immeasurably unwise, infinitely unjust; and, consequently, wholly unworthy of the supreme homage and love of his creatures which he requires! But these disclosures, in place of augmenting his power of preventing his creatures from sinning, would immeasurably increase the force of their temptations to rebellion: would

make revolt indeed a virtue, and convert obedience into a crime!

Dr. B.'s scheme thus again plunges him into an abyss of inextricable difficulties. Instead of answering the end which he endeavors to attain by it, it exhibits the divine procedure as obnoxious, on an immeasurable scale, to the very objections from which he attempts to exculpate it.

4. His notion that the material universe was created after the beings who belong to our race had fallen in a previous life, contradicts in like manner the great postulate on which he builds the whole fabric of his reasoning. He says:

"The scriptural exposition of the system of the universe, as centring in the union of God and the church, inasmuch as it implies and is based on the doctrine of pre-existence, still further takes that doctrine out of the region of mere abstract speculation, and *gives it a practical embodiment in the great central measure of the Kingdom of God.* A measure which is the main subject of the inspired oracles of God from beginning to end: *for the sake of which* THE MATERIAL SYSTEM WAS ORGANIZED, and to execute which the providence of God is administered."

"The whole of *the present dispensation* is a system of sublime *measures*, embodying principles and aiming at a glorious result. The result is an imperishable spiritual structure, including the universe under God and the church as its head. *The measures are* THE FORMATION OF THE MATERIAL SYSTEM, THE INTRODUCTION OF THE HUMAN RACE INTO IT, the incarnation of God, the atonement, the redemption of the church and her union to God, and the prostration of the kingdom of Satan."—Pp. 527, 528.

He thus holds that the material universe was created and man introduced into it, *after* his fall in a pre-existent state; and thence that he was originally a purely immaterial being, and existed, if such an expression is allowable, in an immaterial scene. But if that were so, man could have had no senses, or power of perceiving existences external to himself, inasmuch as there was no medium of such a perception. He consequently could not have had any knowledge of God, unless he had the power of a direct vision of him independently of any external aid—a power that would be equivalent to a faculty of omniscience; for if an intelligence could perceive a spiritual nature external to itself, independently of

any action on itself of that nature, and of any media, no reason can be given why it would not be able to see everything that pertained to that nature; its essence, its attributes, its thoughts, its actions. But the ascription of such a power to intelligences of our race, is to contradict both our nature and the nature of every other order of creatures. We have no such faculty of perception or knowledge, nor is it conceivable that any creature has. To suppose a creature directly to perceive things that lie out of the sphere of his consciousness, without any *means* of perceiving them; to know natures, facts, truths, without any *media* of knowing them, is a palpable self-contradiction. But in the next place, the supposition that man had such a faculty of intuitive knowledge of God, contradicts Dr. B.'s doctrine, that owing to "*the limitation of finite capacities to* COMPREHEND GOD AND HIS WAYS, *and a consequent liability in the first generations of creatures to unbelief, distrust, and sin*," the Most High could not, "in the earlier stages of his system," unfold himself to them in such a measure as to give them a true view of his being, character, and rights, and prevent them from sin: for if they had the faculty of intuitive knowledge of him—of comprehending his whole being, relations, and acts, they must not only have had all the knowledge of him that could have been necessary to inspire them with awe, love, adoration, and trust, but their views of him must have been immeasurably more comprehensive than men now attain, and their condition immensely more favorable to their preservation from sin. Whichever of these grounds he takes, he thus overturns his own system.

If he rejects the supposition that men had, in their imagined pre-existent life, an intuitive knowledge of God, he must then hold one of the three following theories. First, that they had no real knowledge of God whatever; that their thoughts of him, if they had any, were merely conceptional, like the spectres of a dream, and contemplated him simply as an idea without any counterpart in reality: for it is demonstrably certain that if they had neither any media of knowing, nor any power of intuitively knowing him without means, they could not have had any knowledge of him whatever as a real existence: he could, at the best, have been to them only an idea; a creation of their own intellect.

But that supposition contradicts his doctrine, that "the principles of honor and right" "demand that God shall give to all new-created beings original constitutions, healthy and well balanced, and tending decidedly and effectually towards good;" and that he "is bound to place" them "in such circumstances that there shall be an overbalance of influences and tendencies to the side of holiness and not of sin."—P. 214. For nothing can be more certain than that a being who is absolutely precluded, by the limitation of his faculties, from the knowledge of God as a real existence, and can at the best only conceive an idea of such an existence as a mere product of his own mind, without any answering reality existing independently of the idea, has not, as a moral agent, "a constitution that is healthy and well balanced, and tending decidedly and effectually towards good;" for, by the supposition, he cannot possibly acknowledge, love, obey, or believe in God as a real existence, sustaining to him the relations of creator, upholder, and ruler, in which men are required to acknowledge, love, and serve him. The knowledge and love of God are made by his constitution absolute impossibilities. It is equally certain, also, on this theory, that God did not place men in circumstances that produced an overbalance of influences and tendencies to the side of holiness; as, by the supposition, there were not any "*influences*" whatever, nor any "tendencies" to holiness. There was nothing to exert an influence or constitute a tendency, but an idea; and that idea, in contemplating itself as a mere product of the mind, and thereby denying the reality of the being whom it respected, made it impossible that the mind should regard it as really God, and love and worship it as such. Indeed, on the supposition even that the idea was loved and adored, it would not have been the love and adoration of God: as the love and worship of him is the love and worship of him as a real existence, not as a mere idea. If Dr. B. adopts this theory of idealism, therefore, he overturns his own system as effectually as before. It is clear, however, that a being of such a nature, and existing in such a state, would never have an idea of God or any other being, or be excited to thought or feeling in any form. As it would have no senses by which it could be acted on by anything external to itself, and nothing would exist external to itself,

except God, that could act on it and produce perception or emotion, it would of necessity remain in absolute inactivity and unconsciousness, unless God directly infused thoughts or conceptions into it, or gave existence to them by a creative act. His notion, therefore, of a purely immaterial preexistence, unless he holds this last theory of the origin of ideas, overturns his doctrine respecting a fall in that state, by precluding the possibility to creatures so situated, of either a knowledge or even an idea of God.

Or, Secondly, he must hold that God directly infused into their minds a knowledge of himself, or produced ideas of his being, character, rights, and will, by a creative act. But that is equally fatal to him; first, because it contradicts his doctrine, that "the limitations of finite capacities" are such in "the earlier stages of creation," as to render it impossible to God to communicate to them such a revelation of himself as successfully to counteract their "liability to unbelief and distrust" of him: for if God could directly create ideas of himself in their minds, he could undoubtedly create ideas of one kind as well as another, and give them true and influential apprehensions of himself, as easily as such as were imperfect: and next, because those notions of God would necessarily be mere conceptions, or simple ideas, and would contemplate God accordingly as unreal, and the love of them, therefore, would not be the love of God.

Or, Thirdly, he must hold that those creatures were parts of God, and that their thoughts were therefore his thoughts, and their acts his acts. But this pantheism is equally subversive of Dr. B.'s system; first, because it contradicts our consciousness, which he makes the great test of truth: and next, because it is inconsistent with the supposition of a fall of creatures: for if they are parts of God, and all their thoughts and acts are his, it is impossible that their acts can be violations of his rights, or offences against his will. To suppose it otherwise, were to suppose his will opposite to itself, and that he is both absolutely righteous and absolutely sinful in respect to identically the same acts. Whichever way, then, Dr. B. turns, whether to idealism, in some of its forms, or pantheism, his doctrine of the existence and fall of mankind, as pure immaterial entities anterior to the crea-

tion of the material universe, is altogether inconsistent with the great postulate on which he proceeds, and overturns his whole system.

5. He involves himself in a similar conflict with his own principles in the assumption on which he everywhere proceeds, that the present condition of man, and God's procedure towards him, are wholly irreconcilable with the demands of justice and benevolence, on the supposition that he did not exist and fall in an antecedent state. This assumption he makes with the most unhesitating assurance, and it is one of what he calls the main moving powers, which he holds are misadjusted, and which it is his object to reconcile.

"The evidence which sustains the principles of honor and right, as we have seen, originates from the fact that God has so made the mind that their truth is instinctively recognised and affirmed, and is therefore a divine revelation; and also from the distinct recognition of these principles in Christian experience and in the word of God.

"The truth of the fundamental facts concerning the ruined state of man, is evinced by the combined testimony of the word of God, of history, of observation, and of Christian consciousness.

"But that in some way these moving powers have been so misadjusted as to conflict with each other, is obvious from simply placing them, as above developed, side by side. To say the very least, the preceding statements as to the ruin of man do appear directly to conflict with the principles of honor and right which have been set forth, and tend directly to subvert and destroy them. He who holds that God, in the manner already set forth, gives existence to men with natures radically corrupt and depraved, anterior to any knowledge, desire, or choice of their own, with full power to do evil, and none to do good, and then places them under the all-pervading influence of corrupt and corrupting social systems—and, in addition to all this, subjects them to the tremendous and delusive power of malignant spirits, fearfully skilled in the work of developing, maturing, and confirming original depravity—cannot, at least with any apparent consistency, say that the Creator has fulfilled towards them the demands of honor and of right, as they have been exhibited. How can he say that he has regarded their well-being as he ought, or that he has observed towards them the principles of justice? Has he not held them responsible for what exists in them through his own agency, and anterior to any desire, choice, or action of their own? Has he not conferred on them such original constitutions as most

unfavorably affect their prospects for eternity, and render their right conduct and eternal life in the highest degree improbable? Has he not placed them in circumstances which are not reasonably and benevolently favorable to their eternal life?

"He, then, who holds that God is the author of the facts alleged, finds himself constantly urged by the demands of logical consistency, to evade, or else to call in question and deny the real and self-evident principles of honor and right. On the other hand, he who holds to the genuine principles of honor and right, will be no less powerfully urged to deny the facts alleged as to the ruined state of man, and to put forth all his energies to subvert and destroy them."—Pp. 80, 81.

That "the facts as to the ruined state of man" are such as he here represents them, he affirms in the fullest manner; and he maintains accordingly, that, on the supposition that man first comes into being in this world, they are utterly irreconcilable with the rectitude and benevolence of God, and convict him of infinite injustice and cruelty.

This, however, is in direct contradiction to the consciences of men, and the instinctive and irrepressible sense of right and obligation which Dr. B. makes the criterion of honor and justice, and, if true, shows that they are no such authoritative test, and overturns, therefore, his whole system. For men universally are so formed, that when they thoroughly and impartially consider their sins, they naturally and irresistibly feel that they are altogether to blame for them, notwithstanding they do not regard themselves as ever having existed and fallen in any previous life. Their ideas of God's rights over them, and of their obligations to him, are such, that the conviction rises necessarily and irresistibly that they are guilty for their offences, and that the blame for them is wholly their own. It is on this instinctive and rational feeling, that all the laws of all human societies against murder, violence, theft, calumny, and injustice of every kind, are formed. It is on this, that all the regrets, remorse, and repentance for sin that have ever been exercised, have been based. It is upon this that the whole work of redemption, and all the self-reproaches, all the godly sorrow, all the faith in Christ, all the strivings after amendment, that have ever been exerted by the children of God, have been founded; and it is an indispensable condition of such exercises. Were it not for this conviction, a sense of sin, self-reproach, re-

pentance, would be altogether impossible. And were there not an indestructible foundation in the mind for such a conviction, there would be no basis in it on which God could institute and maintain his present government. If, then, this universal voice of conscience, this natural sense of equity and obligation, is such an indubitable and authoritative criterion of right and duty, as Dr. B. contends, it demonstrates with the most resistless certainty that there is nothing in the constitution with which we come into existence, nor in the circumstances in which we are placed, that exculpates us from blame in our sins, and impeaches God's justice or benevolence in calling us into being in such conditions; and overturns, therefore, the assumption on which Dr. B. founds his charge against the Most High. Taking the identical test by which he claims that the question is to be tried—and the verdict of men universally is against him—not a solitary exception can be found in the whole series of the race. However individuals may have speculated, and whatever theories they may have formed, when brought to a practical determination of the question, they have in all instances felt and held that they are blamable for the crimes against men and offences against God which they commit, although they regard themselves as having commenced their existence in this world; or do not resort to a theory of an antecedent life and fall, to account for their having their present constitution and existing in their present circumstances. The position, therefore, on which he builds his whole speculation, is contradicted by the very principles by which he professes to demonstrate that position. Tried at the bar of conscience, or the natural and instinctive sense of right and duty, and the verdict of every individual of the race is, that there is nothing in the constitution with which we come into being, or the circumstances in which we are placed, that exculpates us from guilt in our sins, or justifies us in impeaching God of injustice or malevolence in calling us into being in such conditions. Can Dr. B. have seen this? Can he have discerned that if his assumption were legitimate, it would prove that no sense of guilt or remorse could ever have been felt by men who had no belief in their pre-existence; that no sense of God's justice in their condemnation and punishment could ever have risen in their breasts; no repentance

for sin have been exercised, and no feeling of the grace of the work of redemption, and no disposition to accept it as an unmerited gift? What can be clearer than that he must have run into these contradictions to the most palpable facts of our consciousness, and the clearest teachings of the word of God, without a suspicion of the consequences to which his principles were carrying him?

6. This element of his system not only fails when put to the test by which he professes to try the question, but unfortunately for the validity of his argument, he has wholly neglected to try it by that test. His "alleged facts," that the nature with which we come into life, and the circumstances in which we are placed are such, that on the supposition that we had no antecedent existence and fall, we are excusable, and God is blamable for our sins; or that our moral constitution forces us to feel that we are unjustly dealt with in being held responsible for our conduct, and senteneed to destruction on account of it, is a gratuitous assumption. He offers no proof of it. He gives no specification or definition of what it is in our constitutions or condition which exempts us from blame for our sins, or makes it unjust in God to treat us as forfeiting our everlasting wellbeing by them. He has taken for granted the point on which the whole of his reasoning is suspended. It is not a proper basis for such a system of speculation, merely to state that he believes that there is such an exculpatory element as he represents, in our nature and condition; or that others believe and maintain that there is. In order to render his reasoning valid and convincing, he should have designated some specific defect in our constitution, and some peculiarity in our condition, which our *consciousness*, on the one hand, *can recognise as real*, and *conscience* on the other, or *our natural sense of justice and obligation*, forces us to regard as disqualifying us for the service God demands, and freeing us from blame for our disobedience. Until this is done, no foundation is laid for the vast train of assumption and reasoning which he builds on the presumed existence of his "alleged facts." If he cannot specify some such defect or ingredient of our constitutions, and some such element in our circumstances, which consciousness can recognise as realities, and which conscience forces us to regard as excusing us from

fault, and devolving the blame of our offences, if there be any, on God, he has no means whatever of proving the postulate on which he asserts the necessity of his doctrine of pre-existence; that our moral nature forces us to regard God's dealings with us as most unjust—if this is our first existence—in framing us with such a nature, and placing us in such a condition. He has done, however, nothing of the kind. Nor could he. Had he undertaken it, he would have met with no success. He would have found he was but attempting to make a reality out of a shadow. His postulate would have vanished from his grasp at every step, as his dream-spectres fly when he awakes. He might have enumerated every element, and every defect or limitation of our nature that consciousness recognises as real, and every circumstance in our condition of which our faculties take cognisance; and yet there is not one in the long catalogue, as we have already shown, that in the eye of conscience exculpates us from blame. The verdict, notwithstanding our consciousness of our nature and condition, is universally against us and vindicative of God. There is not a human being who does not regard murder, theft, injustice, cruelty, deceit, fraud, and every other act forbidden by human law, that violates his rights or the rights of others, as criminal. There is not one whose moral nature will not constrain him to feel, when he properly considers them, that all his acts that are forbidden by the law of God, are criminal also, and justly render him obnoxious to punishment.

Dr. B. has thus wholly omitted to consider what the real ground is on which he builds his whole system; the investigation of which should have been the first step in his undertaking, and a thorough comprehension of which would have shown him that the assumptions on which he proceeds are altogether mistaken. It has not come at all within the scope of his inquiries. He has not cast at it even a cursory glance, and the whole fabric of his speculations, accordingly, rests on an unreal foundation. Is it credible, that he would have pursued such a course, were not his views extremely superficial: had he not most seriously mistaken the import of the principles on which he proceeds?

7. He has omitted also to notice an unfavorable bearing of his theory of pre existence on God's justice and benevolence.

of all others, and allowed his fancy, in a bewildering gaze on them, to mould them into unnatural shapes and invest them with a fictitious character?

8. And, Finally, he seems not to be aware of the detraction of the divine character which his notion involves, that it is necessary that God should suffer infinite grief and pain on account of the sin and ruin of his creatures, with patience and meekness, in order to such an evolution of himself as to make it possible that he should secure their full and unwavering love. For he represents that, "a limitation of his power in the earlier stages of creation, owing to the liability of the first generations to unbelief and sin," makes "a season of trial and suffering to God" necessary; "the result of which will be such a full unfolding of his character and truth in act, as shall at length remove from all future generations the causes and the occasions of unbelief," pp. 509, 510. But why is it necessary that God should thus submit to immeasurable suffering on their account—and suffering that, as we have already shown, must continue for ever, and involve the whole universe of holy creatures also in eternal sorrow and gloom? Not to make expiation for their sins; not as a substitute in their place, in order to their deliverance from the just penalty of their offences. No pretence is made that it fills such an office, and the supposition were infinitely contradictious to the sacred word. No sufferings but those of Christ are expiatory. What then is the necessity and object of God's suffering? To develop his disposition, the answer is—to "selfsacrifice" and "selfdenial;" if we comprehend Dr. B., that is, to show that he is ready to forego his rights, rather than that they should lose their wellbeing; that he places a higher estimate on their happiness than he does on the maintenance of the principles of justice on which he founds his government. What else can it be? Could a human ruler prefer to be robbed, calumniated, and abused by his subjects, rather than protect himself by enforcing the law on them, unless he cared more for their gratification than for justice, the maintenance of his government, and his own happiness? But such a course is infinitely derogatory to God; first, because it would show that he placed a higher estimate on the happiness of his sinning creatures than on his own rectitude and the unfaltering support of his govermnent.

If he is all-perfect, it is impossible that he should choose to suffer immeasurably himself, and give up the support of his law, rather than that his revolting creatures should be punished according to their deserts. And that he has no such disposition to give up his rights, and set aside his law, is demonstrated by the fact, that the very object of Christ's mediation and death for us, was to vindicate his rights and sustain his law. And next, it is infinitely derogatory to him, because it implies that his righteousness, sanctitude, and goodness, manifested in the justice and wisdom of his law, and the beneficence of his providence, are not adapted to command the fervent and abiding love of his creatures; that they constitute a character that is suited to inspire distrust and unbelief, and prompt to sin; for why else should it be necessary, in order to win their hearts, that he should abandon his rectitude, and show that he prefers to sacrifice himself and yield up his rights rather than that they should suffer the just penalty of their sins? His theory thus again denies to God the very moral perfections which it is his professed object to vindicate to him. It endeavors to exculpate him from the charge of injustice and cruelty to his sinning creatures, by exhibiting him as infinitely unjust to himself, and regardless in his administration of the great principles of righteousness and sanctitude which lie at the foundation of his government and the wellbeing of his holy subjects. And these false notions of God, the want of just apprehensions of his perfections and rights, are unfortunately characteristic of Dr. B.'s work, and are the ground of his other errors. He appears to conceive of God as very much like a human being in his intellect, his sympathies, and his mode of action; he holds that he is limited in his powers; he judges of him as he judges of men; and he alleges such objections to his government as his enemies, and especially the unrenewed, are accustomed to feel and urge, when under convictions of sin, but which sink into annihilation the moment their eyes are opened by the new-creating Spirit to God's true character, and they become reconciled to him. This is a sad, an awful element indeed of his system; yet no competent and impartial reader, we think, can fail to see that it is one of its most conspicuous features.

We might point out other similar inconsistencies and con-

tradictions of his own principles, and animadvert on a great number of passages in which he expresses very mistaken and reprehensible notions; but these are enough to show that he has entered into no thorough investigation of the subject, and taken no comprehensive views; that he is unaware of the real import of the principles on which he professes to proceed; and that he tangles and confounds the subject on a scale proportional to the success with which he persuades himself his labors are to free it from perplexity.

II. We now proceed to show that his theory is wholly unsupported by evidence; that it is in the most open contradiction to the Scriptures; that it has no adaptation to the end for which he advances it; that it involves the most awful accusations of God; and that it would make it impossible, if intelligently received, to regard him with any other sentiments than distrust, aversion, and horror.

1. The pre-existence of the race, which he affects to establish, is a mere supposition or theory, and is wholly unproved by him. It is not taught in the word of God, nor countenanced in it by the remotest hint. This Dr. B. admits (p. 363). It is not a fact of consciousness or recollection. There is nothing within the sphere of consciousness or memory that recognises or indicates it. So far from it, the supposition implies either that that existence was altogether unconscious, which is inconsistent with his theory of it; or else that our memory of it has been annihilated by an arbitrary act of omnipotence, which is inconsistent with God's truth and equity. If it were a fact, therefore, it could not be proved: as these are the only sources from which evidences of it could be drawn; and, indeed, Dr. B. does not attempt to demonstrate it through either of these channels. The only process by which he affects to establish it is not an argument; for in his second term he expressly denies what he assumes in the first and infers in the third. Stated briefly it is this:

God is infinitely just and benevolent. But his dealings with men in this world are supremely unjust and unbenevolent—unless they existed and fell under a previous administration, in a manner that renders his present procedure towards them consistent with rectitude and benevolence.

Therefore they must have existed and fallen under such a previous administration.

Here his second term or minor,—in place of presenting a definition or explanation which shows that the point he is to infer is embraced in his major,—directly contradicts his major itself; cuts off, therefore, instead of justifying his inference, and presents ground for precisely the opposite conclusion: and it will accordingly be used by the infidel as overthrowing the doctrine of the Scriptures respecting the fall, the condition of men, and the work of redemption; and by the atheist, as disproving the being of God. Thus they will say:

It is admitted by Dr. B., that, judging alone from God's dealings with men in this life, he is immeasurably regardless of the obligations of justice and benevolence.

But all his dealings with men of which we have any knowledge, are his dealings with them in this world.

Therefore, from all the knowledge we have of him, he is immeasurably unbenevolent and unjust.

The infidel consequently will say—The Bible is not true; and the atheist—There is no God of justice and benevolence.

Dr. B. does, in fact, present the elements of this argument in the most direct manner; a large part of his volume, indeed, is employed in laying a logical ground for the denial of God's goodness and justice. Thus the position which he makes the basis of his whole reasoning is, that

"God is bound to give all new-created beings original constitutions, healthy and well balanced, and tending decidedly and effectually towards good:" and "to place" them "in such circumstances, that there shall be an overbalance of influences and tendencies on the side of holiness, and not sin."—P. 214.

But "*the actual facts of this world and of revelation,*" he holds —rejecting the theory of pre-existence—"*are such that they logically lead us to the result, that* THE PRESENT SYSTEM IS INDEFENSIBLE, *and that* GOD DOES NOT DESERVE THE HONOR, REVERENCE, AND WORSHIP OF HIS CREATURES."—P. 217.

It follows, therefore, as all our knowledge of him is compspired in "the actual facts of this world," that all that we

know of him proves irresistibly that he has no title to our homage, but is infinitely unbenevolent and unjust.

Yet Dr. B. does not see this. So far from it, he regards the alleged impossibility of vindicating God from the facts of this world, as demonstrating that man must have pre-existed in a different state where the facts were such as to justify him in his administration over them here; and urges his argument with an air of assurance and triumph that bespeaks a wild hallucination, rather than sobriety of mind. Thus he says:

"If it can be shown that the facts of this moral and physical system, taken as a whole, are such as to demand a pre-existent state, in order to explain them, or as much as the facts of the material system demand the law of gravitation to explain them, or as much as the facts of the whole system demand God as their cause, then the doctrine of a pre-existent state can be proved by the highest possible proof—proof so clear and so strong that no intelligent being need wish to go beyond it. Let me state a single course of reasoning, which of itself would be all sufficient.

"The laws of honor and of right are of God; nor has he ever violated them, nor will he. This is the premise of an argument powerful enough to revolutionize nations and churches, and to shake a world.

"Taking, then, this premise, I allege that if the facts and principles that have already been set forth are true, there is a brief argument, entirely within our reach, and comprehensible by all, which of itself is enough to settle the question for ever.

"If the facts which have been stated concerning the ruined condition of man are true, and if the principles of honor and right have been truly set forth . . . . and if [as he holds] the common theory arrays the principles of honor and right against the conduct of God, whilst the other exhibits them as in harmony, then it follows of absolute necessity that the common view is false, and that which I advocate is true. If the premises are granted, the conclusion is inevitable: and no argument can exceed this in power. The argument for the being of God has no superior force. The proof that the Bible is the word of God, is no more conclusive. The proof of the Newtonian theory is not more powerful, although that is regarded as established beyond any rational doubt."—Pp. 452, 453.

But this argument, instead of any such merits, overturns and confounds itself. For his premise that God is indisputably, perfectly just and good, is directly contradicted by his

minor proposition: since, if, as he there asserts, "the actual facts of this world and of revelation are such that they logically lead us to the result that the present system is indefensible, and that God does not deserve the honor, reverence, and worship of his creatures;" then, inasmuch as we have no "actual facts" whatever but the "facts of this world," we not only have no evidence that he is just and good, but we have positive proof that he is not. In asserting, therefore, that so far as our means of knowledge go, God is indefensible and unworthy of honor and worship, he cuts himself off from the right to assume that he is not equally indefensible and unworthy of homage in all other spheres in which he may be supposed to have acted. To assume that because he is indefensible *here*, he is infallibly defensible in all other worlds; that his being infinitely unjust and malevolent in his dealings with men now, demonstrates that he must have exerted an administration over them in another state that was marked by infinite rectitude and goodness, is to assume that infinite injustice is a proof of infinite rectitude; infinite cruelty of infinite benevolence; and instead of reasoning, is a mockery of logic.

Accordingly, in thus denying the perfections of the Most High, which it is the object of his theory of pre-existence to vindicate, he cuts himself off from that object, and pronounces it unattainable. What an absurdity, after asserting that God is not defensible, to resort to the theory of pre-existence, to show that, notwithstanding his indefensibleness, he still is defensible; to attempt to annihilate by a supposition, what he in the same breath asserts is demonstrated to be a reality by all the facts within our knowledge? Yet that process which thus contravenes and reverses the laws of reasoning, he declares with the utmost assurance, "no argument can exceed in power. The argument for the being of God has no superior force. The proof of the truth of the Newtonian theory is not more powerful."—P. 453. Did ever infatuation transcend this? That process will prove as effectually that the great fallen angel is just and benevolent as it will that God is. According to Dr. B., there is no more absolute proof, so far as the facts of this world are concerned, that Satan is an unrighteous being, than there is that God is. He may, therefore, with equal propriety assume that notwithstanding these

facts, Satan is a just and benevolent agent, and then, as he does in his argument respecting God, allege that all the unrighteousness and malignity that mark his agency in this world, are so many proofs that he must have existed in some previous state in which his condition and agency were such as to reconcile his evil actions here with rectitude and benevolence, and make him a proper object of approbation and love. The same process will prove also with equal certainty that men are not sinners. For why may he not with as much propriety assume that something existed or took place in a previous state, which reconciles all the evil conduct of mankind here with rectitude and benevolence, as assume that there was something in a previous state that reconciles all God's dealings with men here,—which, taken as they are, Dr. B. pronounces infinitely evil,—with the dictates of justice and goodness?

In whatever light, then, this boasted argument is considered, it not only confutes and confounds itself, but recoils with a most demolishing power on its author. What faith can be put in the reasonings, what confidence can be felt in the judgment of one, who is so utterly regardless of the laws of logic; who is the victim of such shallow and fanatical delusions! The whole idea, indeed, of seeking a solution of the difficulties of the present system by a theory of pre-existence, is a consummate self-contradiction and absurdity. For as we confessedly have no consciousness or memory of such a pre-existence, the supposition of it implies that God has struck it out of our consciousness and knowledge by an arbitrary act of omnipotence. What then can be more idle and preposterous than to fancy that we can still discern what he has designedly withdrawn from the sphere of our vision! that we can still see what he has hid from us in impenetrable darkness: that notwithstanding the impassable barriers that separate us from it, we can make our way thither by the force of our reason, carry the light of day into its unfathomable abyss, and discover the mysterious realities with which it is peopled! A maniac might attempt such a task; a man of sense surely would not. It involves also an awful impeachment of God's rectitude and benevolence, for it implies that he has, by an annihilating act, deprived us of the knowledge of a fact, the cognizance of which is indispensable to

a just understanding of his procedure towards us, and has placed us thereby under an invincible necessity of misjudging of his character and disapproving of his ways. It accuses him, therefore, of the very injustice and malevolence from which it is Dr. B.'s object to vindicate him.

2. His theory of pre-existence is in direct contradiction to the Scriptures, which teach in the most express and unequivocal manner, that Adam and Eve were created on the sixth day of the Mosaic epoch. "And God said, let us make man in our own image, after our likeness. And God created man in his image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."—Genesis i. 26, 27. And this is repeated by Christ, who declares that "from the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female." Mark x. 6. God's creating them was his calling them into being. It can no more be pretended that their creation was not the beginning of their existence, than it can that the creation of the heavens and earth, the atmosphere and sea, the herbs, fish, birds, reptiles, and other animals, was not the beginning of their existence. To suppose that they did not come into existence by creation is to suppose that they are self-existent, and therefore are not creatures. All the other statements on the subject in the sacred volume also, either directly teach or imply that that was the original of man, and that all the other individuals of the race have come into existence as the offspring of that created pair. All the measures of the divine administration also proceed on it as a fact. To deny it, and assign to them a pre-existence, is therefore to offer the most flagrant contradiction to the testimony of God's word respecting their origin. It is an equal contradiction also to the teachings of the Scriptures respecting the fall of Adam, and the influence of his fall on the character of his posterity. For they declare in the most explicit and emphatic manner, that sin entered into the world by his transgression of the law of Eden, and that it was in consequence of that act that his posterity became sinners. "By one man [Adam], sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all, for that all have sinned." "By one man's disobedience the many were made sinners."—Rom. v. 12–19. No language can be more explicit and unequivocal than this. It is to offer it the boldest contradiction to assert that Adam and Eve had

existed and fallen in a previous state, and that their eating the forbidden fruit was not their first transgression, nor the occasion of their posterity's becoming transgressors.

Dr. B., indeed, denies that this is the proper meaning of the passage, and exhausts all the resources of his ingenuity to fasten on it another sense; but his attempts are unsuccessful, and only show the hopelessness of his cause, and the unpardonable lengths to which, to carry his point, he is ready to go in violating the laws of language, and misrepresenting the principles on which types are used. He boldly denies that there is any real connexion between Adam's sin and the sin of his offspring, such as the passage affirms, or between his sin and their death, and asserts that it is only an apparent connexion, and that that apparent connexion was established only that it might be used as a type of the connexion that subsists between Christ's obedience and the justification of men.

"All the language in this passage, which is commonly understood to assert that the sin of Adam exerted a causative power upon the condition and character of his descendants, need not be understood to denote real causation, but may . . . be held to denote only apparent causation . . . and that, moreover, such a sequence of apparent causation was established solely in order to make Adam a type of Christ.

"The passage, then, thus viewed, teaches that God was pleased to establish immediately on the sin of Adam, and through that sin, the sequence of condemnation to natural death upon all men; a sequence linked to Adam's act by no causative power, but established solely as a type and illustration, both by similitude and antithesis, of the sequence of justification and life eternal from the obedience of Christ—a sequence in which there is a real and glorious causative power.

"Such a sequence, in itself devoid of causative power, but established for typical purposes, I call a merely typical sequence. It is not founded in the nature of things, but in a positive arrangement, design for typical effect."—Pp. 374, 375.

A more extraordinary group of blunders and misrepresentations we have never seen crowded in so brief a passage. In the first place he totally shuts out of view the great fact asserted in the passage we have quoted from the apostle, that SIN entered the world by Adam, and that it was by *his sin*

that all others became *sinners*, and represents that all that the passage teaches is, that a sentence to natural *death* was passed upon all men in immediate connexion with his sin. Can a grosser misrepresentation be conceived? That a sentence upon all to natural death followed as a consequence of Adam's sin, does not prove that sin did not enter the world in his transgression, nor that it did not pass to all, or that all did not become sinners in consequence of that sin: so far from it, the apostle expressly declares that it was by sin that death entered, and that so, that is by sin, death passed upon all, for that all have sinned. Sin and death are not the same any more than obedience and justification are; but death has its ground in and is a consequence of sin; precisely as justification has its ground in and is a consequence of righteousness. Dr. B. thus begins his attempt to establish his point, not by an *interpretation* of the passage, but by boldly striking from it the part which demonstrates his construction to be false.

In the next place, he offers a point-blank contradiction to the Scriptures, in asserting that death is not the penal consequence of sin, and has in it its sole ground and cause. For the Bible everywhere represents death as the penalty of transgression, and inflicted solely because of it. Such are the teachings of the law of Paradise: "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat, for in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die."—Gen. ii. 17. That is the teaching of a crowd of passages in the Old Testament, in which it is declared that the person that sinneth shall die. And it is expressly affirmed in the New Testament, that the sin of Adam carried death to the whole race. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." No bolder contradiction to the teachings of the Bible on this subject, therefore, can be offered than Dr. B.'s representation that the sin of Adam is not a real cause, in any sense, of the sentence of death upon all, but is only apparently connected with it; and that the seeming connexion of death with his sin, is only designed to represent the antithetical connexion of life with Christ's obedience. It is nothing less than saying that the specific penalty of sin, and the greatest and most terrible punishment that is inflicted on account of it in this world, is not a punishment of sin, and forms no expression

of God's displeasure on account of it; but is only connected with it for a typical purpose.

In the third place, he is wholly mistaken in imagining that the passage teaches that the connexion of the death of men with Adam's sin is a type of the connexion of justification with Christ's obedience. Not a shadow of any such intimation is presented in the passage. On the contrary, its language and the principles of typology wholly preclude it. Dr. B. runs into the strangest blunders and extravagances in his view of this subject. He says:

"It is in accordance with the laws of language and the usages of Scripture, to suppose that the sequence is one of merely apparent causation; so that the sin of Adam, in fact, *exerted no influence whatever on his race*, but it and its sequences were merely ordered so to stand in relation to each other, as to make at the very introduction of the human race into this world, a striking type of the coming Messiah, by whom the race was to be redeemed. On this latter supposition, the fallen condition and depravity of the race are assumed as having been already in existence, and the doctrine is that the events connected with the introduction of the race into this world by one man, were such as to form a type of the relations and acts of the coming Messiah in redeeming the church.

"Those interpretations which assume a causative sequence, make the sin of Adam really to cause either natural death or condemnation, or depravity to all the race, and so to do it as to be a type of the coming Messiah.

"The interpretation which I propose, makes it a divinely established antecedent, without causative power, but designed to make, in the opening scene of this world's history, a sublime impression and beautiful type of the coming Messiah. The truth of this view, as I have said, is the fundamental question of the whole discussion. It is also a question the importance of which cannot be over-estimated. It is also a question, so far as I know, *never thus raised or discussed before*. It has been generally assumed that whatever it is that followed the act of Adam, it was linked to it by the power of a real causation. No one seems to have thought that any law of language, or any usage of Scripture, gave us our choice here between real and apparent causation . . . .

"It is my purpose, therefore, to show that the laws of language and the usages of Scripture do not shut us up to such a mode of interpretation; that the mode which regards the sequence as merely

apparent and typical is in perfect accordance with Scripture usages, and the just laws of interpretation."—Pp. 376–378.

Our space will not permit us to reply at length to all these extraordinary misrepresentations. We shall simply point out his principal errors.

First, then, the apostle's expression, "Adam . . . who is a type of him that was to come"—Christ—does not signify at all, as Dr. B. assumes, that Adam was a typical *representative* of Christ, but simply that he bore a resemblance to him. That any one may see by looking at the word in the lexicons, or, as we shall soon show, at the subject of which the apostle is treating. In what respects then was it that Adam presented a resemblance to Christ? Simply in his being the head of the race, and, as such, transmitting by his conduct a vast influence to them. His act in sinning was not typical of Christ's act in obeying; nor was the penal consequence of his fall to his posterity typical or representative of the judicial consequence of Christ's obedience to the race. Dr. B. has fallen into a total mistake, therefore, in supposing that Adam was a typical representative of Christ in the sinful act that he exerted and the penal effect which he transmitted to his children; and has built his whole speculation on a basis that has no existence except in his bewildered fancy.

Next, it is impossible that Adam's sin and its penal consequence to the race, should be typical representatives of Christ's obedience and its judicial consequences to men, from the fact that instead of resembling each other, they are the most direct and absolute opposites. Typical representation is founded altogether on analogy. An agent or thing, in order to be a type of another, must bear a resemblance to that which it typifies, in the special respect in which it is used as a type. If a type of Christ for example, as an expiatory sacrifice, is to be used, it must be a thing that has a life that can be taken away, and blood that can be shed: and the shedding of the blood of the one must represent the shedding of the blood of the other; and the loss of life by the type must represent the loss of life by the typified. Agents represent agents, causes represent causes, acts acts, effects effects, relations relations, and conditions conditions: and

the types are always realities as truly as the things typified. It is a total contradiction, therefore, to the principles of typology, to suppose that Adam's sin can be a type of Christ's obedience; and death the penal consequence of his sin, a type of life—the judicial consequence of Christ's obedience. Who would think of using an extinction of the eyes as a type of the restoration of sight; of a departure from life, as by murder, as a type of an entrance into it by birth: or a burial as a type of a resurrection? A child who should fail to see the incongruity, the senseless contradiction of such an attempt at representation, would be considered as sadly devoid of understanding. Dr. B. is undoubtedly entitled to the credit which he claims of originating this notion of typical representation by antithesis. Like a delirious person, whose fancy converts the dungeon in which he is confined into a splendid palace, his fetters into regal ornaments, and his guards into courtly attendants who are employed in paying him homage and executing his will, he invests the objects with which he is dealing with a wholly false nature, and looks at evil as the proper symbol of good, at darkness as the representative of light, at misery as the emblem of happiness, and at death as the type of life! What exquisite perspicacity! What a beautiful mental constitution to set up as the beau-ideal of truth and rectitude;—the standard by which the infinite Jehovah is to be judged, and if found not to accord with it, accused and condemned as immeasurably unjust and malevolent!

Dr. B.'s notion that Adam's sin is a type of Christ's obedience, and death, the penal consequence of his sin, a type of the life which is the consequence of Christ's obedience, is thus utterly false and revolting. It has no sanction from the Scriptures or "the laws of language," but is in the boldest contradiction to both.

Thirdly. There accordingly is no intimation whatever in the passage, that sin and death are types of obedience and life. So far from it, the effect of the sin of Adam is *contrasted*, in a number of particulars, with that of the obedience of Christ: "But not as the offence, so is the free gift; and not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift" by one that obeyed: and the only point in which they are compared, is *the universality with which they transmitted their effects to men:*

as by Adam's sin all were sentenced to death, so by Christ's obedience all are sentenced to a restoration to life by a resurrection: and as by Adam's sin the many were constituted sinners, so by the righteousness of Christ the many are constituted righteous (vs. 18, 19), the point, and the only point, in which the effects of their actions resembled each other. And this comparison accordingly, instead of sustaining, confutes Dr. B.'s notion that the connexion of death with sin is merely apparent, and overturns his whole construction. For it is a law of the simile, that the names by which the things that are compared are designated, are used in their literal sense. No example can be found in the whole range of language of a contrary usage. The fact, therefore, that a comparison is instituted betwixt Adam's sin carrying death to his posterity, and Christ's obedience carrying a restoration to life to them, shows with the clearest certainty that Adam's sin is the real cause or ground of death to his posterity, as literally and as absolutely as Christ's obedience is or is to be the cause or ground of their resurrection to life. And in like manner the comparison instituted between Adam's disobedience making many sinners, and Christ's obedience making many righteous, shows that Adam's disobedience is the real ground or cause of their being made sinners, as truly as Christ's obedience is the ground or cause of their being made righteous. The connexion in the one case is as real and absolute as in the other. His notion of a mere seeming connexion, a simple proximity in time, "established for typical purposes," is a fiction of his imagination, without a shadow of authority from the passage or any other part of the Scriptures, and against the laws of the comparison and the principles of typology.

Dr. B. thus wholly fails in his attempt to force a false meaning on this passage, and shield his theory from the discredit of a direct contradiction to its teachings respecting the fall and ruin of the race; and the unwarrantable expedients to which he resorts, leave a most damaging impression respecting his principles and judgment as an interpreter and logician.

3. His theory of pre-existence has no adaptation to the object for which he employs it. It presents no vindication of God from the objections which he urges against his dealings with men in this world.

It does not follow of necessity, on the supposition that men existed and fell in a previous state, that God's administration over them there, was not essentially like his administration over them here. Dr. B., in assuming that his government over them in a pre-existent state must have been far more favorable to their virtue and happiness than it is here, takes for granted the very point which he affects by his theory to prove—namely, that God is infinitely just and good, and that his justice and goodness must necessarily have prompted him to pursue a more favorable course towards them in a pre-existent state than in this. But that he cannot assume, after having affirmed that all the facts that lie within the sphere of our knowledge demonstrate that God is not just and good, but instead, is immeasurably unjust and unbenevolent. If that, as Dr. B. maintains, is the character of God's administration here, so far from there being any certainty that his government in a pre-existent state must have been different, the presumption is infinitely against it. His theory, therefore, not only gives no relief from his difficulties, but it exhibits them as altogether irremovable. To vindicate the Most High by his theory from the accusations which he alleges against him, he must bring positive proofs that God exerted over them such an administration in that state as he holds was required by righteousness and benevolence, and justifies him in his dealings with them here. He, however, not only brings no such proofs, but the impeachment with which he starts renders the attempt preposterous.

4. Instead of vindicating God, it detracts from his perfections, exhibits Christ as a fallen being, and converts the work of redemption into a chaos of contradictions and deceptions.

It represents God as infinitely arbitrary, and exerting acts that would render trust in him impossible. According to Dr. B. the Most High annihilates by a sovereign act the consciousness or memory in every human spirit of a previous existence, and all the acts it exerted, and all the events of which it was the subject in that state. Of the number of beings whom the theory represents as subjected to this process, no conjecture can be formed. The generations that have already come into life here amount to many thousands of millions; and as the race is to continue to propagate through

eternal ages, they are infinitely to transcend all our powers of enumeration. They are to be numerous enough, he directly implies, to people the whole material universe. Whether this infinite host are all now in existence, were all created at the same time, all fell at the same epoch, and were immediately on their fall divested of their consciousness; and whether, therefore, those who have not yet entered into a second life have been struck with insensibility through thousands of years, and immeasurably the largest portion of them are to remain locked in unconsciousness through myriads and millions of ages to come, Dr. B does not inform us. These great questions, so immediately suggested by his theory, have not attracted his attention. The annihilating act he thus ascribes to God, is more momentous and awful than any other that he was ever charged with exerting; and were it believed, would render it impossible to repose any confidence in his truth or uprightness. For what can be supposed to have prompted him to so arbitrary a measure, unless it were a wish to conceal from his creatures some feature of his administration over them that was unjust or unwise, and the knowledge of which would necessarily make him the object of distrust and aversion to them! And how flagrant must have been that defect, to have made such a measure necessary to hide it from their gaze! But if he has already been under a necessity of resorting to such a stupendous violation of the nature of his creatures to prevent them from discovering his true character, who knows but that he may feel equally obliged, in the course of the administration he is now pursuing, to annihilate their knowledge of themselves and of him again! Who can tell, but that at some future time, he may not only strike from our breasts all consciousness and memory of what we are and have been, but substitute a false consciousness of identity and a false memory in their place? Who could feel safe for a moment under the sway of such a being? What deceptions and treacheries were ever conceived, compared to those which this theory thus ascribes to the Most High! What accusations were ever before framed, that so utterly divest him of his perfections, and exhibit him as an object of distrust and horror!

The theory implies that Christ is, in his human soul, a fallen being. He is, as man, one of the human race, as truly

as any other individual. If the whole, therefore, existed and fell in a previous state, his human spirit must have existed and fallen there as well as the others. And Dr. B. utters no intimation that such was not the fact. He has not looked far enough, perhaps, to see this implication of his doctrine. If he has, he has kept it out of sight. His theory, therefore, implies that the character ascribed to Christ in the Scriptures is immeasurably false; that instead of being the object of perfect approbation to the Father, he was a sinner and under condemnation; and that he was thence wholly unfit for the office and work of Mediator. What a beautiful result of Dr. B.'s contrivance to adjust the great moving powers of Christianity,—the wheels by which the moral universe is impelled, so that they shall act in harmony!

It implies that Christ's expiation is wholly inadequate to the justification of men, inasmuch as it is made only for their sins in this world. His headship of the race, like Adam's, is a headship of them only as inhabitants of this world. His work, as Mediator, has no relation to an antecedent existence. If then they existed and fell in a previous state, their sins in that state are left unexpiated; they are consequently without any provision for a full forgiveness and acceptance; and thence, as all unexpiated sin draws after it its legal penalty, instead of being redeemed they are lost.

It implies that a perfect repentance for sin is impossible. A consciousness of sin is necessary in order to repentance for it. There can be no sense of sin and sorrow for it, where all consciousness and memory of it have been obliterated from the mind; where all possibility of knowing that we are guilty of it is swept out of our reach. But according to this theory, God has, by an act of omnipotence, eradicated that pre-existent life and our fall there from our consciousness and memory. He has made it impossible to us, therefore, to regard our sins there with penitence; and consequently, if he justifies us, he will justify us in impenitence for that part of our offences.

And, finally, to complete the climax of its self-contradictions and absurdities, it implies that there could not by any possibility have been a fall in such a state; inasmuch as there could not have been any God, any moral universe, or any law. For as we have shown on a previous page, his notion

that the material universe was created after that supposed fall, implies that the beings presumed to exist before that creation, were purely immaterial, and thence could have had no senses, nor other means of perceiving or inferring the existence of anything without themselves. Each one would have been as absolutely isolated from all others and from God, as though there were no other existence than itself. As nothing could act on them from without, nothing could come within the sweep of their knowledge or thought, except self-originated and independent operations of their own nature; if even any such movements would have been possible. Nothing, therefore, could by possibility suggest to them a thought of God or of a fellow creature; and if there did, it could be but an idea; a mere conception or imagination. It could not be a reality; and consequently there could be no real external God to love and obey; there could be no law imposed by a real divine lawgiver, and thence there could be no transgression of such a law and fall. The whole universe is converted into a mere ideal system, without a deity or a creature, without a lawgiver or a law, and consequently without a transgression or a penalty. The theory thus ends by again confuting itself, and sweeping away the whole ground on which its fabric rests.

We might add other proofs of its error, but these are sufficient to show that so far from having any claims to belief, it is but the wild dream of a disordered intellect, in open contradiction to the Scriptures, fraught with the most revolting detraction of God's character and government, and making, were it accepted, all faith in him, and all hope of redemption by Christ impossible.

We shall resume the subject in our next number.

ART. IV.—INFIDELITY: ITS ASPECTS, CAUSES, AND AGENCIES; By the Rev. Thomas Pearson, Eyemouth, Scotland. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1854.

BY THE REV. R. W. DICKINSON, D.D.

THIS book, as it is written in a perspicuous and flowing style, may be read with ease, and not without profit, by

those who would acquaint themselves with infidelity in its several aspects, and be furnished with the ordinary and more obvious arguments by which either atheism, pantheism, naturalism, or pseudo-spiritualism may be met. Its tendency is rather to expose than to refute; to guard the believer in Revelation rather than to convince the sceptic. The author has evidently acquainted himself with the various works of infidel writers, and being at the same time familiar with the writings of those who, in defence of revealed truth, have treated all the topics which he has successively introduced, he shows with what facility a well-read man, with a ready memory and a command of language, may make a book, and that, too, of no ordinary size. It is essentially a re-production rather than an original work—advancing no view which is not familiar to us, offering no argument which may not be found in some other treatise. Indeed, the author hardly makes a remark which, before the end of the paragraph, he does not himself trace to its source by a quotation of some favorite author. This indicates no lack of candor, but unhappily it may betray a want of something else quite as essential to intellectual influence. An occasional quotation may adorn a page or corroborate a position, but so to multiply extracts, and from favorite authors, as that the reader shall be virtually told, from page to page, that some great writer thinks as our author does, or that our author thinks as some celebrated man has expressed himself, denotes a mind either conscious of its weakness, or devoid of all habits of independent reasoning.

Nor can it avail with our modern sceptics to remind them of what Chalmers has eloquently said, or Foster strikingly observed. Be it so that many of the greatest minds have decided in favor of Revelation; enough for your Parkers and Newmans, that they differ from others; or rather that they have advanced on all preceding writers—that their systems embody the latest developments of the human intellect! Let us see to it that we oppose them by the weapons of Scripture, and not by the remarks of others; by the force of reason, and not by the authority of names. Had all superfluous quotations been omitted, and the style been less diffuse, the size of the volume would have been lessened

generally effective mode of presenting the truths and requirements of the Bible, that some preachers evince more ability and adaptation than others, and that all who occupy the sacred desk should, like "the most popular and useful preachers on both sides of the Tweed," be intelligible to the "feeblest of the flock," and "acceptable to the more refined and intellectual;" this, of course, may not be questioned; but how such preaching can be regarded with "jealousy" by good men; or how any can be so "intolerant" as to be "jealous" of it, we are at a loss to understand. In alluding, however, to "what is wanting" in the pulpit, he admits that it is by *no means* desirable to make any material change in our usually adopted style of preaching, and far less to strip the gospel of its peculiarities, or to throw them into the shade, in order "to remove the offence of the cross;" and if there has been no material change in "the common mode of pulpit address," and no merging of the peculiarities of the gospel into neological or other views, how could there have been any occasion for "jealousy" on the part "of some of the professed friends of Christianity?" And if, as our author admits, there should be "no material change in pulpit address," and no *philosophic* effort made "to remove the offence of the cross," why does he stigmatize those who may object to "any departure from the common mode of address," and to any attempt to accommodate religious discussions to the taste, literature, and *philosophy of the times*, as *intolerant?* There is a contradiction here which might have been avoided had his ideas only been more definite on the subject, or had his judgment been less biased by his own style of writing. No one can reasonably object to different styles of pulpit address. This is unavoidable, unless preachers are to throw their thoughts into stereotyped forms. But to clothe gospel truth in our own language, is one thing; to accommodate religious discussions to the taste, literature, and philosophy of the times, is distinctly another. And who is to be the judge whether we are sufficiently accommodating to these features of the times? On this point, Combe would differ from Pearson (p. 124), and who is to decide between them?

But "it is the want of Paul's principle of accommodation of which we complain," says our author. We admit that

unfavorable bearing on Christianity," when the preacher has only "stripped false systems of their pretensions, and exhibited by contrast the glory of the true?" But enough; divested of its verbiage, our author's position amounts to this, that all passages are not to be treated in the same way; that if one should select as his text, "Their rock is not as our rock, our enemies themselves being judges," he would be justified in departing from the usual style of preaching on some other text,—for example, "Marvel not, I say unto you, ye must be born again."

On page 449, Mr. P. observes that "the jealous exclusion of almost every topic from sacred teaching, which is not *directly* included within the system of *evangelical doctrine*, or the intolerance shown when an occasional *excursion* is made beyond the *prescribed boundary*, has induced many to associate the grand themes of the pulpit with a narrow and illiberal exclusiveness." By the prescribed boundaries of the pulpit, we understand the boundaries marked out by the whole range of God's book to man—no more, no less; and if the exclusion of topics foreign to the letter and spirit of this book, is an indication of intelligence, then Paul's preaching, notwithstanding his principle of accommodation to which our author refers, can be no standard for us in these days of mental enlargement and liberal sentiments. On Paul himself rests the blame of having caused many to associate with the grand themes of the gospel, a narrow and illiberal exclusiveness, not on those who act on what Mr. P. regards as "Paul's noble declaration, to know nothing among men but Jesus Christ and him crucified." In making such a remark, however, he was probably misled by the apparent import of Dr. Vaughan's observation which he thought necessary to introduce. It is, as it were, a sentence preparatory to a quotation; and if the quotation were in point, the preface to it is not in keeping with our author's expressed repugnance, to lay aside the common mode of address, or obscure the prominence which should be given to the doctrines of the cross. But what greater consistency could be expected of one who says, on one page, that the style that is wanting already "extensively prevails," and in course of a few pages more, says, "it is undeniable that Christianity, in the teaching of *by far* the greater number of its devoted ministers,

son's work, to Conybeare's article, to show that we may defeat our own end the moment we attempt to go beyond the great causes of infidelity, such as are obvious in man's ignorance, and pride, and depravity; such as He, who knew what was in man, and could not err in his judgments, did himself refer to, and whose conclusions are in accordance with the philosophy of our moral nature. To denounce evengelical preaching as favoring scepticism, were about as legitimate as to make Christ himself responsible for all the infidelity in the world; it were to make the truth the cause of all opposition to itself! And in like manner to assign, what we may conceive to be a want of adaptation in the pulpit to the times, or a refusal to admit some theory which we may have adopted, as a cause of infidelity, is to dive t the general mind from essential truth; to raise irrelevant issues; to convict ourselves of private biases; to justify any one in denouncing *you* as an infidel, if you will not accord with his æsthetical judgments, his speculative positions, or his ecclesiastical dogmas.

It is the common expedient of a certain class of minds to make all departure from their own views a sign or a cause of infidelity. To fortify themselves in a false position, to conceal from the public the weakness of their own arguments, or to preclude the mortification of being obliged to acknowledge their error, men are but too apt to impute to others the motives of which they are themselves conscious, to imagine that they are contending for the truth when it is only for themselves—that the truth will suffer, that infidelity must spread, if their conclusions are not admitted and believed. Thus it is that Rome makes Protestantism identical with infidelity; and that Oxford has aimed to brand Puritanism as the cause of modern scepticism. With one, the cause of infidelity is found in dissent from the church "by law established;" with another in the rejection of "Apostolical Succession," through the line of Prelatical Bishops, which if we do not admit, neither can we prove the truth of the Bible! with still another in the re-presentation of the doctrines of the Reformers! So does the Socinian think that if his views were embraced there would be less infidelity; and so in turn do other errorists, from the most intellectual and æsthetic down to the most embittered and

Mr. Pearson remarks, the independent existence of one absolutely perfect Being, the creator, preserver, and governor of all things—the doctrine of the Trinity, the Incarnation and Atonement of the Son of God for the salvation of men, and the necessity of the Spirit's influences to regenerate the souls of men." The Bible teaches us what God is, and what he has done; what man is, and what he needs. This is clear as noontide certainty; so obvious, that if it be not granted, it may with more show of reason be denied that the Bible has any meaning at all. Though here and there is a passage which requires studious thought, and may possibly admit of several constructions; though there is scarce a passage which may not be wrested from its context and perverted in its meaning (and what is there that the wit of man may not twist and turn to suit his purpose?) yet is its main drift so palpable that it can hardly escape the most casual observer, much less elude the apprehension of persons of ordinary capacity, when carefully studied. The very fact that the Bible arrays against itself all classes of mind, is proof conclusive that its obvious teachings are neither indefinite nor unintelligible. But as "the fool has said in his heart, there is no God," so men "like not to retain the knowledge of God." They "will not come to the light lest their deeds should be reproved;" they "love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil." Not daring, perhaps, altogether to reject a book which is accompanied with so great an array of proofs, or it may be, not willing to incur the odium which is thought to attach to avowed infidelity, they contrive to confound the teachings of the Bible with the theology of man, or the creed of a sect, and thus quiet themselves in the practical rejection of its truths. Or when convinced that it is as useless as disingenuous to deny the obvious import of Holy Writ, it is then their expedient, in order to evade their obligations to believe, to explain the teachings of the Bible in accordance with some pre-conceived theory, or to invalidate the proofs of its divine inspiration. Thus infidelity, whatever the guise it assumes, may in every instance be traced to a perverse and rebellious will; and under its control everything in turn may become, not the cause, but the occasion of infidelity, or serve as an apology for rejecting the teachings of the Bible or denying its inspi-

ration. As are the desires and affections of the man, so does he will, and so does he act. "The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life," may control even the decisions of a speculative philosophy; and to the mind of the flesh, consequently, we may trace with metaphysical exactness the indisposition of some to study the Scriptures, and the disposition of others to open them only with a view to gather materials for strengthening themselves in some sceptical position. The mind of the flesh! this brings down the great God to the standard of the sensual judgment, and may preclude belief in anything that is not palpable to sense: this severs all moral relations, and confounds all moral distinctions; induces illogical habits of generalizing from some few isolated particulars, or substitutes its own preconceptions and prepossessions for the conclusions of reason, and deductions from facts; this, too, obscures the excellences of Scripture, and magnifies seeming defects—attaches more importance to what has not been revealed than to what has been clearly made known to us, and often imparts to some trifling, perhaps irrelevant difficulty, a force sufficient to outweigh the greatest amount of proof that was ever brought to establish any fact in man's past history. Reluctant to investigate the evidences of unwelcome truth, indifferent to what is true or false, except so far as either may subserve their selfish interests and private gratification; intent on either enriching, distinguishing, or enjoying themselves, it is not surprising that in order to fortify themselves in their unbelief and preclude all compunctious visitings, they should identify Christianity with its corruptions, and the Christian spirit with religious intolerance, and Christian union with sectarian divisions. It would not answer their purpose to stop and discriminate for a moment between Christianity and Romanism, or between a Christian and a zealot—much less to reflect on Christianity in its purity, in its benevolence, and in its harmony as portrayed by the evangelists and exemplified by the apostles. They do not even wish to inquire whether any may be found whose Christianity is pure, and whose spirit is Christ-like, and who amid circumstantial variety, or denominational differences, substantially agree in all essential truth. To ascertain this would be to divest themselves of one of their favorite arguments. It is sufficient for them to

know that there are corruptions and divisions in the church, and that they often encounter religious intolerance; and therefore, among so-called Christians, there is no charity, no agreement, and Christianity cannot be true or worth embracing! It is obvious that one must be himself an infidel, or at least already strangely disposed to scepticism, who can impose on himself by so glaring a paralogism.

The several things which Mr. P. specifies among the causes of infidelity, may be regarded as auxiliary in a measure to it, but they cannot be logically viewed as inducing that state of mind which, if it did not already exist, could not be excited by adventitious considerations. Aside from moral causes—the pride of intellect—the love of self and the world—the repugnance of human nature to authority—the perverseness and imperiousness of the human will—it is difficult, and to say the least, of questionable utility, to specify anything as a proper cause of infidelity. Certain things unquestionably minister to sceptical thoughts; certain systems of philosophy and of theology tend to betray their adherents into pantheistic and atheistic notions, or may confirm men in their infidel conclusions; and hence the necessity for ever distinguishing the teachings of Scripture from the teachings of men, and of ever separating Christianity from the corruptions that are both in the church and in the world through lust; but let us be careful how we relieve the infidel from that weight of personal responsibility for his sentiments which he would gladly throw off from his own conscience, to be devolved on those who profess to believe. Were it not for the "evil heart prone to unbelief," neither "speculative philosophy," nor "social disaffection," nor the "corruptions of Christianity," nor "the disunion of the church," nor "religious intolerance," the causes our author enumerates—would render any one who had been acquainted with the Christian Scriptures, an avowed infidel. Had our author omitted these altogether, and confined himself to moral causes in their detail, he would have relieved himself of much unnecessary labour, and secured to this part of his book more logical consistency, and practical influence. Not a little that is written in the second part of his book, is strictly implied in the first part, and especially in his essay on Pantheism and Naturalism; but through his zeal to detect

But *jealous* of the advancement of *science*, they are not, and cannot be. This were to suppose that science could conflict with Revelation; that God's works could contradict his Word; that the Author of the Holy Scriptures is not the Creator of the heaven and the earth. Whatever seeming discrepancies there may be between nature and Revelation, we as firmly believe as does our author, that there "can be no real contradiction;" and hence, that the *facts* of geology are not at variance with the inspired record of the creation. But is everything worthy of the name of *science?* and are religious men to be denounced as intolerant who will not so misuse terms as to dignify conjectures and assumptions with the name of science? Let it be proved that geology is properly a science, before we can be legitimately required to bow to its decisions.

Let it be proved that the earth is as old as geologists would have us suppose, before we are dogmatically called on either to reconcile the Mosaic record with the hypothesis, or quietly to sanction its rejection by geologists. We maintain that the premises of their theory are not tenable, and that their deduction from geological phenomena does not follow, even on their own principles of reasoning, respecting the formation of the stratified beds of the earth. Aside from the fact that the processes through which some geologists represent the materials of the strata to have passed, are contrary to the laws of nature, no length of time can account for the manner in which the earth's strata were formed; because there are no conceivable sources whence the materials for strata, formed in such a way, could have been drawn; and the principles by which physical questions are determined, forbid "the assumption of any event as a fact which cannot be proved to have taken place."

The theory of the earth's high antiquity is doubly an assumption: first, that the materials of the existing strata were derived from disintegrated continents of granite, and secondly, that the strata were formed by the ordinary forces of nature, such as are now seen to operate; these forces having, according to the theory, never acted with any greater degree of intensity than they now do. We do not, therefore, object to it so much because it is anti-scriptural, as because it is a false interpretation of the "great stone book;"

directly traceable to pre-existent types, and not generated by other beings of their own order:—a mode of reasoning which will not meet Hume's position, "That for aught we know, *a priori*, matter may contain the source or spring of order originally within itself, as well as mind does; and that there is no more difficulty in conceiving that the several elements, from an internal, unknown cause, may fall into the most exquisite arrangement, than to conceive that their ideas in the great universal mind, from a like internal, unknown cause, fall into their arrangement." For, according to the premise of Mr. Pearson's argument, these new creations are instances of organization of which no cause can be seen except the matter of which they consist; nor is his argument strengthened by a remark from one of his favorite authorities (Dr. Chalmers), that "were all the arrangements of our existing natural history destroyed, all the known forces of our existing natural philosophy could not replace them;" for this amounts to little more than a truism,—that were there no animal and vegetable life, there would be none!

If the proof of Divine agency in the creation of these "new races" does not lie in their organization, in their powers and adaptations,—*i. e.* in their whole nature,—how can it be any proof that they are without a fossil genealogy? not a transmutation, or a gradual variation from some original type, but, according to geological classification, a distinct species? If the organic remains of races that existed, according to the geological creed, ages before the earth of the Mosaic record, do not imply Divine agency in their original formation, then no "new races of animals" could have required, in order to their production, "the interposition of God." But on the other hand, if these organic remains must once have been instinct with life, and, as living creatures, must once have embodied, in their whole constitution, ample proof of a creator, then the argument drawn from what is termed a distinct example of the creation of numerous organic beings, and set forth with an air of confidence and triumph,—as though Divine interposition in the history of this world had never been proved before,—is, to say the least, altogether superfluous.

To reconcile, therefore, this geological notion of the earth's extreme antiquity with the first chapter of Genesis,

(for he admits that there is an *apparent* discrepancy), he virtually tells us that the fair and obvious meaning of the Mosaic record of the creation is no longer to be received. 1st. To accommodate *scientific* inquirers who do not wish to impugn, much less to reject, the Mosaic narrative, but who are perfectly satisfied that Moses, though he accomplished a most remarkable journey, never instituted a geological examination of the earth's strata. 2d. Because Galileo was sent to the dungeons of the Inquisition for embracing the Copernican doctrine. 3d. Because the Franciscan and Dominican friars were so sadly deficient in the science of Biblical interpretation that they mistook figurative for literal language. 4th. Because Hugh Miller says "that no geologist worthy of the name *began* with the belief of the antiquity of the earth, and then set himself to square geological phenomena with its requirements." Dr. Brewster says, "that the God of nature may be equally worshipped in the temple of science." Mr. Babbage says, "that some of the most enlightened minds have nourished a secret opposition to the doctrine of Christianity, owing to the intellectual intolerance of its abettors;" And 5th. Because Dr. Chalmers has decided that the first verse in Genesis stands as a distinct and independent proposition, and refers to an undefined antiquity—though this interpretation is in fact, our author says, "no novelty." It was "the interpretation of many of the ancient church writers," &c. Such is the *substance* of Mr. Pearson's reasoning. Now, we need not stop to remark, that it can be of very little consequence to us in investigating scriptural truth, what this or that one *says*. We want the *proof* of what they say. Nor can we admit that geology is a science, much less that it is to be ranked in the same category with astronomy, as an "inductive science." Nor do we think it worth while to argue with one who can gravely draw a parallel between a poetic form of speech, and a historic statement of fact; and much less with one who is so devoid of analogical perspicacity, as to class those whose reasons for rejecting the theory of the earth's remote antiquity have never yet been refuted, with the friars, who, through bigoted ignorance, opposed all philosophy and all science. Nor will we intentionally wrest the meaning of Scripture to afford room for our airy speculations, and much less those

of others, however profound they may be in philosophy, or eminent in science. Let every man on his own responsibility ascertain the meaning of this book, which we call the Bible. Momentous interests are involved in its true construction. But let no one denounce us as intolerant, because we will not accord with his construction; still less as unreasonable, unless he can furnish us with some valid arguments for his own view.

The light in which Mr. P. views the first verse of Genesis is no interpretation at all; and if it were the right interpretation, it would not relieve the subsequent verses of the chapter from the difficulties with which they are beset, and well nigh overturned by the conditions of the geological theory.

"The variance between the Mosaic record and the geological evidence," Mr. P. asserts, "is only apparent, not real; it vanishes before a *sound principle of Scripture interpretation.*" A sound principle indeed, not "the narrow principle of interpretation to which some good men doggedly cling;" which is employed, not to determine the meaning of the first verse of Genesis, but to prove that innumerable ages intervened between the creative acts which are narrated in the first and second verses; not to show the harmony of the several parts of which the narrative is composed, but to place the first verse in opposition to those which detail the six days' work of creation in order to force it into harmony with the geological theory; not to show that the record is connected, consistent, and explicit in its statements of facts, but to make the sacred historian contradict himself, that the advocates of the geological theory may not be thought to contradict and falsify his statements!

"This principle," as Mr. P. observes, may be "no novelty;" and some may view it as he does, as "the harmonizing principle;" but no principle, if indeed we must speak of it as a *principle*, could have been more inconsiderately adopted; for the construction which it sanctions, proceeds on the supposition that, the first verse of Genesis refers to the creation in the beginning of the whole material universe, whereas the word *heaven*, as employed in the chapter, denotes the atmosphere—the region above where the sun and moon and other orbs appear to be stationed; and that

there were other worlds, in the *b*
inferable from the scriptural represe
foundations of the earth" were laid,
together, and all the sons of God sh
It perverts the grammatical constru
for the earth spoken of in this verse
first created, without form and void
it will exhibit Moses as endorsing th
the earth, instead of having been a
waste, was, after having been the t
animal life through an immeasurab
merged beneath the ocean to the
animal and vegetable life, and so be
were animals and vegetables before
the second verse, there must have b
the earth must have been illumine
loped by an atmosphere; but on th
tion, the dry land had not appeared,
the face of the deep. This constr
according to the *principle*, has been
accommodate the ancient animals an
implies, that when the earth was red
the waste of the second verse, its atr
hilated, and the light-giving orbs ha
power of illuminating its surface; th
tion, not only at variance with the
record, but inconsistent with the laws
conflict, moreover, with the facts of
But it is not necessary for us in th
than advert to the reasons which hav
in this Journal in opposition, eith
interpretation," or to the modern ge
it necessary, as yet, to put any ot
Mosaic record than that which its
import warrants. It will be time
elastic principle of interpretation,
grounds for the geological theory th
As yet the theory is devoid of a sci
sistent with itself; and the more cl
less can it stand the test of reason a

This is no mere assertion. For proof we confidently refer to the discussion of the subject in this Journal, and challenge a reply. See Nos. xvi., xvii., xviii., xx., xxi.

For ourselves, we do not pretend to know the age of the world. It may be six thousand years, or more. But if any devotee of science feels called on to write a geological history of the pre-Adamite earth, let him not so weakly deceive himself as to imagine that we are responsible for his infidelity, should he see fit to reject the Mosaic record of the creation, because we may not be prepared to falsify its obvious meaning, and render Moses subservient to the sale of his book and the fame of his name. If one is thoroughly persuaded in his own mind that he has more light on the creation than Moses could have had, why, be it so. But on his own head devolves the responsibility of repudiating the Mosaic record; not on us because we adhere to the record. And if his expressed views and avowed convictions tend to lead others to disparage the record—to attach to it no weight in comparison with so called scientific discoveries; then on *him* devolves the responsibility of undermining the faith of the Bible, not on those who adhere to the law and the testimony.

This is certain, however, that there is no gain to the cause of revealed truth by compromising its teachings with opposing views, any more than to the cause of religion by conformity to the world on the part of its professed adherents. Let this principle of interpretation be adopted in relation to one part of Scripture, and it must be in relation to other parts. If there are men who will reject the Mosaic record, unless we read it with geological optics, so are there men who will reject the Bible, unless we adapt its construction to the views of naturalists and pantheists. But if men will have us reconcile God's word with their views, or reject it, what are they but *infidels already* without our aid? If they cannot justly charge upon us their erroneous views, then they shall not make us responsible for them, by inducing us to accommodate our views to theirs, in order to quiet their consciences in the rejection of the truth.

ART. V.—THE PRIEST AND THE HUGUENOT; or Persecution in the age of Louis XV. From the French of L. Bungener, author of "The Preacher and the King." In two volumes. Boston. Gould and Lincoln. 1854.

BY THE EDITOR.

THIS work, written on much the same plan as the author's Preacher and King, is designed to exhibit "the principal religious aspects of France," and especially the persecutions to which the Protestants were subjected, from the accession of Louis XV. in 1715, to his death in 1774. They are presented in a series of scenes, at the court at Versailles, at the capital, in the principal palaces and cathedrals of the great towns, and in the mountains and deserts of the southern provinces, in which the king and court, eminent catholic prelates and priests, the leading infidel philosophers, and the popular Protestant preachers and chiefs, are introduced and made in conversations, debates, harangues, and other actions appropriate to their several spheres, to display their principles, their passions, their manners, and their policies, and present a living picture of the age. This is a species of composition for which the writer's intimate knowledge of the actors and events of that period, his vigorous imagination, and his rich fund of thought and sentiment, eminently fit him. He conceives with great distinctness, and paints with power. Whichever way he turns, the scene on which he enters, the spectacle he wishes to create, rises with the utmost clearness to the eye; every individual appears in his appropriate dress and attitude, every act and gesture is seen, every accent is heard, and the play of thought and passion is felt as sensibly as though the pageant, instead of a fiction, were a present reality. Many of the scenes are drawn with great power and excite an impassioned interest;—such as that at the royal chapel when the court preacher was prevented from ascending the pulpit, and Bridaine, a semi-liberal and evangelical priest, assumed his place; that in the desert, where the apostate Cevanol attempted to betray Rabaut, the leading Huguenot preacher: the interview of Rabaut with the prisoners in the tower of Constancy; his escape from Charney's party att he

house of Rabaut, and finally the tragedies at Toulouse; in which, on the one hand, the victims of persecution displayed in eminent beauty—at the bar, on the rack, and at the scaffold—the lofty calmness, meekness, fidelity, and courage, which are characteristic of the faithful martyrs of Jesus; and their torturers and slaughterers, on the other, exhibited in all their hideousness, the falsehood, the treachery, the malice, the more than savage barbarity, that have ever been the character alike of Pagan and Catholic persecutors. Though a few of the personages, perhaps, and some of the incidents are created by the author to exemplify the age, they are neither unreal nor exaggerated, but are specimens, veiled under fictitious names, of the genuine actors and occurrences of the time, and present a true picture of their principles, manners, and history. The style is excellently adapted in its ease and brilliancy of delineation, sprightliness, and point, to the theme, and to a graceful transfusion into our language, and the translator has performed her task with unusual tact and elegance. There are many fine passages, and they have in their new dress all the naturalness, force, and grace, of superior original English compositions. The reader will derive from the perusal, not only a high and novel entertainment, but a just and impressive view of that age in which the wild beast and its drunken rider—who are now threatening to renew their war on the Protestants of France—wreaked their infuriate passions in the most savage modes, on the followers and confessors of Jesus; and the martyrs displayed in their patient submission to the most cruel injuries, and cheerful surrendery of their lives to his cause, the beauties of their meekness, faith, fidelity, and love, in the loftiest and most touching forms.

France has been the theatre of some of the most violent wars of the antichristian powers on the true worshippers, during the last eight hundred years, and is dyed with the blood of a greater number of the martyrs of Christ than any other country. The southern provinces were the scenes of the most cruel and bloody persecutions by the pagan rulers in the second and third centuries. One of the most touching narratives of those ancient martyrdoms is that by Irenæus, of the persecution at Lyons, in the year 177, when a crowd of confessors were thrown into dungeons, put to the torture,

doctrine, and re-establish the Catholic faith. In 1176 and 1178 a number of Albigenses were arraigned at Toulouse and condemned as heretics; and in 1179, the third Lateran council denounced the whole party, and forbade, under the threat of an anathema, that any one should receive them into his house, allow them to occupy his land, or have any transactions with them. On the accession of Innocent III. to the papal throne in 1198, he sent agents to excite the bishops and princes to coerce them by anathemas, threats, and persecution, or drive them into exile; and several, ere the year closed, were consigned to the flames. These measures, however, not succeeding to his wishes, he, in 1204, sent legates to traverse the country, denounce the new faith, and excite the Catholics to more vigorous efforts to crush it; and at length, in 1207, induced the duke of Burgundy, and several other princes, to institute against them a crusade of pillage, slaughter, and conquest; divested the count of Toulouse, in whose territory the Albigenses chiefly resided, of his right of dominion, and absolved his subjects from allegiance; authorized the appropriation to themselves by the crusaders of all the property of their victims, and stimulated them to the work of outrage, blood, and devastation, by indulgences on an unexampled scale, and the promise of eternal life. And to give success to this atrocious scheme, a vast troop of monks was employed to proclaim the crusade in France, Germany, and Italy, and excite the necessitous, the unprincipled, and the cruel to engage in it. Among the most active of these bloody preachers were Dominic, the head of the Dominicans and founder of the Inquisition, and Francis, the head of the Franciscans. The principal region first devoted to this vengeance was the territory of the viscount of Alby, Beziere, Carcassone, and Limoux, in Languedoc. At length in the spring of 1209, the army collected by the monks for the war, consisting partly of crusaders returned from the holy land, who were accustomed to pillage and murder, and partly of desperadoes and cut-throats of the most lawless character, began to concentrate in three divisions, amounting together, at the lowest estimate, to fifty thousand. To these were added a vast crowd of vagabonds, plunderers, and pilgrims, whose object was, not to act as troops, but to glut their brutal appetites and wreak their savage passions

on the helpless who might fall into their power. On the approach of this murderous host, the barons, knights, and their retainers generally, retired to their fortified cities and castles, and called in their peasants; but they were soon deserted by them for the woods and mountains, or fell into the hands of the invaders. Among the first that was conquered was Chasseneuil, which, after an obstinate defence, surrendered; and though the garrison was allowed to retire unmolested, the unarmed inhabitants, men, women, and children, were consigned, without discrimination, to the flames, and the property given up to plunder. The three armies soon united in the siege of Beziere, a fortified town, ordinarily of not more than fifteen thousand inhabitants, but augmented at the time by twenty-five or thirty thousand, collected from the neighboring cities and villages. It almost immediately fell into the hands of the besiegers, and the whole of the vast crowd found within it, consisting chiefly of women and children, were put to the sword. Not a solitary individual was allowed to escape. The churches to which they fled as sanctuaries proved no protection to them. The pavement of one of them was drenched with the blood of seven thousand victims. The whole number that perished is estimated by a single writer of the time at but thirty-eight thousand; others, however, placed it at sixty thousand. After the slaughter had been completed and the houses plundered, the city was set on fire and reduced to a heap of ruins. Not an edifice remained. From this terrible massacre, the crusaders proceeded to Carcassone, the next principal town of the region, from which, however, all but four hundred and fifty of the garrison and inhabitants escaped by a secret passage. Of those, four hundred were consigned to the flames, and fifty to the gallows; and the place was given up to pillage. The fate of these cities struck the inhabitants generally of the region with terror, and induced a large share of them to quit their castles, and fly to the forests and mountains for shelter, where crowds perished from want and exposure; such of them, without exception, as fell into the hands of their enemies, were burned alive or put to the sword, their dwellings consumed, and the country converted into a waste.

As the object of the crusade in that territory was thus mainly accomplished, the marauding hosts were chiefly dis-

banded, and returned to their homes; but the legate, ambitious to continue the contest, conferred the conquered territory on Montfort, an ambitious and cruel prince, caused a new crusade to be preached by the monks to furnish him with troops, and prompted him to invade the territory of the counts of Toulouse, of Foix, and of Cominges, and wage a similar war of extermination against their subjects. The annals of savage barbarity present nothing that equals the atrocities of his career. He first attacked a number of castles in the territory of which he had become possessed, and put all their inhabitants that fell into his hands to death, or tore out their eyes, and sent them to proclaim to other places that the same fate awaited them. On entering the dominions of the counts of Toulouse, of Foix, and of Cominges, he consigned all who fell into his hands in like manner to the sword, the scaffold, or the pyre; and after a warfare of massacre and devastation, of four or five years, during which he put immense numbers to the sword, and reduced large districts to a desert, he was, in 1215, invested by the Pope with a large part of the territory of the count of Toulouse, which he had overrun, and such of the scattered Albigenses as survived, were reduced to silence, or forced to assume the air of submission to the Catholic church. Nor was the evil confined to them; but thousands, also, in the neighboring parts of France, suffered a similar martyrdom. Wherever the marauding hosts turned, they waged a war of extermination. The inhabitants of hundreds of villages were consigned to promiscuous carnage; dwellings were everywhere pillaged and burned, and fields wasted with devastation.

Nor did the warfare then cease; but new crusades were preached, fresh armies were gathered to the standard of Montfort, and the country continued to be drenched by the blood of its inhabitants, and strewn with desolation, till the death of that monster in 1218. The contest was soon revived by his successor, and continued to rage for thirty years, when a large share of the territory passed into the hands of the king of France, and the cause of the church triumphed. Of the numbers who perished in these bloody crusades, no exact estimate can be formed. They amounted, there is reason to believe, to more than a million. Thousands of families were wholly extinguished; whole communities were extermi-

nated; crowds were driven into exile; and the few that survived were reduced to the lowest depths of poverty and wretchedness.

These merciless robbers and cut-throats, however, were not the only enemies to whose malice the Albigenses were exposed. While those infuriate hosts aimed to exterminate them, and consigned the whole population of the cities, castles, and hamlets, that fell into their power, to destruction, and drove thousands who evaded them to perish by a more lingering death in the forests and mountains, the Pope devised and established an Inquisition at Toulouse, under the auspices of Dominic and Francis, for the purpose of detecting and punishing such of them as might survive. That was the origin of the bloody tribunal which still bears that name, and was for ages a more dreadful engine of terror, of torture, and of death, than any other that ambition and malice have ever contrived. How many of the unfortunate Albigenses became victims of that cruel power, there are no means of knowing. Under its fearful espionage and discipline, however, the voice of dissent was hushed into silence, and though the true faith was still cherished in many households, and transmitted from generation to generation, till, at the distance of three centuries, the Reformation dawned, it was veiled beneath a seeming indifference, or an apparent acquiescence in the reigning superstitions.

These terrible means employed by the Catholic church to crush her opponents, and maintain her lawless power, present a true index of her character, and brand her as a monster of injustice and impiety, more hideous than any other that has ever strode the earth. To say nothing of her long career of almost unlimited authority under the emperors, she had then been nationalized by the monarchs of the western kingdoms more than six hundred years; and embraced in her bosom all the talent, the learning, the arts, and the influence of the age. What, then, were the measures which she employed to arrest the spread of what she denounced as heresies, and bring the ingenuous, pure-minded, and conscientious rejecters of her idolatries and usurpations to submission to her authority? Did she rely on the proclamation to them of the gospel; on the communication of a larger measure of knowledge; on the arts of kind and patient

persuasion? Did she endeavor to raise them to a higher grade of culture, to soften and refine their manners, to imbue them with nobler sentiments, to inspire them with the love, the faith, the awe of God, and the desire of his kingdom, which are the distinguishing characteristics of his children? No. Such measures would only have confirmed them in their dissent, and rendered their concurrence in her impious dogmas, her idolatrous rites, and her profligate manners, impossible. Her only instruments of persuasion were denunciation, anathemas, and menaces of vengeance; and when they were found inefficacious, her only method of silencing their dissent was to kill them: to wage against them a crusade of pillage, outrage, and massacre; and to consign such as escaped that wholesale carnage to the gibbet and the pyre, and exacerbate their destruction by all the tortures and horrors that the most refined ingenuity and infernal malice could contrive! And in the infliction of these infinite outrages on the unresisting lambs of Christ, her savage heart found a drunken and delirious joy. Their piteous groans, their shrieks of agony, were drowned by her shouts of mockery, and infuriate exultation! And such is the spirit that still reigns in her iron breast. Such are the tragedies she is now flattering herself she is soon again to re-act.

The rapid spread, at the beginning of the Reformation, of the new doctrines, in the central and southern parts of France, indicated that the faith of the Albigenses still reigned in secret in many hearts; and was the signal for the renewal of a persecution that continued with few intermissions through three hundred years; was marked by the most awful atrocities of which the world has ever been the theatre; and consigned, there is reason to believe, from two millions to two millions and a half, and perhaps a far larger number, to torture and death, or to a cruel exile.

An edict was issued against the Protestants in 1523, and in the following year the first victim, the minister of a congregation at Meaux, was burned alive. Many others were consigned to the same cruel death in the three years that followed; and in 1528, at Paris, six were burned at one time in the presence of the king. The persecution was waged throughout the whole kingdom, and raged with such severity as to drive many into exile.

In 1545 the president of the parliament of Provence made war on a body of Vaudais long settled there, gave up a number of towns to pillage and conflagration, and besieging Merindol and Cabrieres, put all who were captured to the sword, set fire to a building into which, after the most infamous outrages, a crowd of women had been driven, and, by the bayonet, prevented their escape; burned the houses, filled the wells, destroyed the harvests, and converted the region into a waste. Nearly eighteen thousand were either butchered in this savage crusade, or driven into the neighboring kingdoms.

An edict in 1551, that placed the Protestants under the jurisdiction of the civil in place of the ecclesiastical courts, checked the persecution for a time, but it was soon renewed by the instigation of armed mobs of desperadoes and assassins to assail and murder the Huguenots when assembled for worship. A congregation of four hundred, who had met in the evening to partake of the Lord's supper, were attacked in that manner in Paris, in 1557, a large number of them murdered, and others who were seized, arraigned and condemned, and several of them burned at the stake. By an edict soon after issued, the Inquisition was established, and its agents empowered to inflict capital punishment on all who were found guilty of heresy. These enormities, however, did not check the extension of Protestantism. It spread rapidly, in the southern provinces especially, and was openly embraced and favored by several princes of the royal house, many of the nobles, and a large part of the population; and reached so commanding a position in numbers and power, that the congregations generally emerged from the unsettled condition in which they had before existed, and organized themselves openly by the election of pastors, the appropriation or erection of places for public worship, the institution of a general synod, and the adoption of a confession of faith and a system of discipline, by which the whole body of the Protestants was organized as a denomination, and put into a state to act together, and maintain their common rights. The attitude thus assumed by them, the likelihood that they might rise to a majority in the nation, and the possibility that the son of Jean D'Albret, the niece of Francis I., and queen of

Navarre, who stood at their head, might become heir to the crown, alarmed the other branches of the royal family, and the Catholics generally, and led to fresh and more violent persecutions, and at length to the attempt, by a general massacre, to extinguish the party. New edicts were issued, orders were sent to the provinces to hang the preachers without trial, and to declare it criminal for the Huguenots to assemble for instruction and worship. These outrages were resisted, and, in some instances, avenged by similar inflictions on Catholic priests, and the pillage of their churches. To check the anarchy that was likely to prevail, and save the Catholics from the destruction which they were endeavoring to inflict on the Huguenots,—for the latter being quite equal in numbers, and having full half of the nobility on their side, the Catholics were likely to be struck with as effective blows as they were able to inflict,—an edict was issued, in 1562, legalizing, in a measure, the assemblies and worship of the Huguenots, though under conditions unjust, irritating, and, in many cases, impracticable. They were required to surrender the churches which had once belonged to the Catholics; they were prohibited from assembling within the walls of cities, and driven to the fields without the gates, or to private and unsuitable edifices, and were enjoined to go unarmed. This legalization of the Protestants, in place of producing peace, prompted the Catholic princes and priests to more resolute efforts to exterminate them, and soon involved the two parties in open war. Great efforts were made to excite the popish party to violence. Maledictions and menaces were thundered from the pulpits: proposals and exhortations were uttered to destroy the Huguenots; and where the Catholics were in sufficient force, and not restrained by the authorities, they assailed, abused, and assassinated them. The soldiers of the duke of Guise attacked those residing at Vassy while assembled for worship, and killing upwards of eighty, most of them unarmed and helpless, the aged, women, and children, and wounding two hundred more, stripped the dead, and made a spoil of their ornaments and dress. Similar atrocities were perpetrated at Cahors, Toulouse, Sens, Amiens, and Tours. In the latter town, three hundred Protestants were shut up, without food, for three days, then bound together, two and

two, and led to a slaughter-house, and put to death. At Sens a massacre was continued for three days, and the bodies of the victims thrown into the Seine.

These butcheries alarmed the Protestants throughout the kingdom, and led them to resolve to take up arms and wage open war as the only means of safety; and while the Catholics attacked those of the capital, drove them from their houses of worship, and ordered them to leave the city in twenty-four hours under pain of death, the Protestant party took possession of Orleans, Tours, Bourges, Poitiers, Rouen, Havre, Lyons, Montauban, Nismes, and most of the fortified castles of Normandy, Languedoc, Dauphiny, and several other southern provinces fell into their hands. The Catholic atrocities that marked the progress of the war almost transcend belief. Carnage and conflagration were the invariable consequents of their success. No security existed, either for property or person, for age or sex. The faith of treaties and the sanctity of oaths were set at naught. Tortures the most cruel and prolonged, were inflicted on those who had surrendered on capitulation. Husbands and fathers bound and stabbed in the presence of their wives and daughters, were then forced to witness their subjection to the most infamous outrages. After the capture of Rouen by the Catholics, at which the king of Navarre, who had joined that party, was killed, and an unsuccessful siege by them of Orleans, during which the duke of Guise was assassinated, the peace of Amboise was concluded, by which the Protestants were allowed the free exercise of their religion in all the towns in their possession; but these pledges were immediately violated, and the old policy of armed mobs and wholesale assassination resumed. Attacked and slaughtered with impunity, and obtaining no redress in appealing to the parliaments or king, they took up arms again, made themselves masters of Orleans, and many towns in the southern provinces, and of La Rochelle, which was one of their principal and best fortified cities. These measures led to a fresh treaty in 1568, in which the privileges granted by that of Amboise were again guaranteed to them. But it proved but a farce. Almost immediately the populace of the large towns, instigated by furious priests, committed the greatest outrages on the Protestants. Appeals and remonstrances to

the government were unheeded. The doctrine was openly promulgated from the Catholic pulpits, that no faith was to be kept with heretics, and that to slaughter them was the dictate of justice, and a work of piety that would be rewarded with salvation. Plots, tumults, outrages, and murders were the consequences everywhere, and no one was sure of his own life, or the lives of his family. More than two thousand Huguenots were, in the space of three months, thus sacrificed. The queen soon issued fresh edicts against them, revoked all the concessions made in the late treaties, and absolutely prohibited, on pain of death, the exercise of any religion but the popish. This led to a fresh war, which, after a number of battles and sieges, resulting in no decisive success to either party, was concluded in another deceitful peace in August, 1570, giving fresh guarantees to the Protestants, allowing them the free exercise of their religion in all the places in their possession, and in the suburbs of two towns in each province, and other privileges; and permitting them to hold four towns as pledges for the strict observance of the treaty.

About this time the horrible purpose appears to have been formed, and at the instigation of the Pope, to cut off the Huguenots by a general assassination; and the way was prepared in a measure for that atrocity by the slaughters, the terrors, and the mortifications the Catholics had suffered during the civil wars, as well as by the hope with which they had become inspired by the fall of the most talented chiefs of the Huguenots, the return of great numbers, especially of women, to the Romish church—to shield themselves from the outrages to which they would otherwise have been exposed,—and the prevention of any further large accessions to the Protestant ranks, by the resentments with which the Catholics had generally become inflamed. This condition of the two parties, despair of accomplishing the extinction of the Protestants by any other means, and an infuriate desire to wreak on them their vengeance, prompted the court to that dreadful tragedy, in which they hoped, at one blow, to sweep a large share of them to the grave; and in which probably one hundred thousand actually became victims of their daggers.

To bring the Protestant chiefs within their power, the mar-

riage of Margaret, the sister of Charles IX., with Henry de Bearne, son of the queen of Navarre, was proposed; and Jean D'Albret, the mother of Henry, and all the leaders and nobles of the party were invited to be present at Paris at the celebration of the nuptials. Into this specious snare they were drawn, with several thousands of their principal retainers. Jean D'Albret, a few days after reaching the capital, died, as was by many believed, of poison. The Protestant chiefs were, on their arrival at court, treated with the most flattering consideration; every artifice was used to remove their apprehensions, and inspire them with a feeling of security. The marriage took place on the 18th of August, and was celebrated with great pomp. On the 22d, as Coligny, the military chief of the Huguenots, was returning from the palace to his lodgings, accompanied by a few noblemen, he was shot by an assassin, employed for the purpose by the duke of Guise and the queen, and dangerously wounded. The court affected to be indignant at the outrage, and still veiled their bloody scheme, while preparations were making for its execution, till half-past one on the morning of Sunday the 24th, when the command was given by the king at the instigation of Catherine de Medici, his mother, and her minions, to commence the slaughter; and the great bell was sounded as the signal for the onset. Bodies of soldiers and a vast crowd of assassins immediately rushed from concealment, and began the work of death. The duke of Guise, with three hundred soldiers, hastened first to the lodgings of Coligny, to complete the task which his assassin had but half accomplished, and beating down the gate, killed him and such of his attendants as had not escaped by the roof, and threw his body from the window to the pavement. The slaughter was at once begun in every part of the city; the houses of the Huguenots being marked with a white cross, that the assassins might know which to assail, the doors were beaten down and the inmates put to the sword without respect to age, sex, or rank, and, in many instances, with every aggravation of insult, outrage, and barbarism that a brutal ferocity could inflict. In most instances, as they were surprised in sleep, no resistance was offered. The victory of the murderers was undisturbed except by tears, cries, and entreaties. When the sun rose, Paris was one vast scene of

tumult, consternation, and carnage. The streets were running with blood; the corpses of men, women, and children, lay stretched in the deserted houses, or strewn in the streets; the groans of the wounded and dying, the shrieks of those who were assaulted by the murderers, the shouts and imprecations of the assassins resounded on every side;—the butchers by thousands, insulting and outraging their victims before killing them, and the rabble following the butchers, and wreaking their infuriate malice on the fallen Huguenots, by re-stabbing, mutilating, torturing, and dishonoring them. The Huguenots, who were lodged at the Louvre, six hundred in number, and comprising the principal attendants of the prince de Bearne, were led into the court, and in the presence of the king and his mother, who looked at the spectacle from a window, bound one by one, stabbed, and dragged aside and stripped.

The destruction continued for four days, and in every variety of form. They were dashed from the house-tops; they were thrown into the Seine, and prevented from reaching the shore; they were shot down; they were butchered like animals. Those who attempted to secrete themselves were hunted from their concealment. Those who had taken refuge in the houses of their friends, were seized and dragged forth to slaughter. On the fifth day, the carnage being chiefly completed, while the city was still reeking with blood, the queen caused the Catholic clergy to celebrate their triumph by a pompous procession, public thanksgiving, and a chant of Te Deum.

On the cessation of the massacre in the capital, orders were sent to the governors of the provinces and principal towns, to imitate the example which the court had set, and consign the Huguenots in their jurisdictions to destruction; and they very generally obeyed. At Meaux, the Huguenots were slaughtered for several days, and four hundred of their houses pillaged and devastated. Great numbers were massacred at Troyes, Orleans, Bourges, and Angers. At Rouen, the slaughter lasted four days. The victims, called by their names from a list, were led out and surrendered to the butchers. Six hundred perished there. At Toulouse, the Huguenots, three hundred in number, were kept in prison a month ere being led to execution. The victims at Lyons

amounted to more than a thousand. Nearly every principal town was the scene of a similar carnage.

The whole number of victims in the kingdom is placed by De Thou, a Catholic historian of the period, at but 30,000; by Sully, a Protestant, at 70,000; and by Péréfixe, Catholic archbishop of Paris, at 100,000. To these are to be added a crowd who died from terror, anguish, want, and exposure. Nor was the tragedy confined to them. Multitudes escaped the slaughter by abandoning their homes and property, and flying in poverty and misery into exile. The news of this atrocious massacre was received at Rome with transports of savage joy. Solemn thanksgivings were offered, cannon were fired, and the Pope proclaimed a jubilee, and struck a medallion in honor of the event.

Such were the perfidious and bloody means the Catholic church and the French court that executed its wishes, employed to rid themselves of the party who rejected their usurped authority and idolatrous worship, and bore witness to the truth as it is in Jesus. Not an emotion of pity rose in the breast of one of the great prelates; not a remonstrance was uttered in the principal cities against the unheard of outrages; not a whisper of compassion or consolation was breathed into the ear of one of the victims. The shouts, the imprecations, the ribaldry of the fiends, were the only accents she addressed to the dying: the cut-throat and the assassin were her only preachers. Where in the annals of this fallen world, shall we look for an equal display of demoniac malice, of brutal ferocity?

This terrible blow was very far, however, from annihilating the Protestants. The death soon after of Charles IX., and the escape of Henry de Bearne, the king of Navarre, from the court, his renunciation of the Catholic faith—which he had been forced to profess,—and the determination of the Protestants to defend themselves, led at length to a peace in 1576; his restoration, with the prince of Condé and the Protestant lords generally, to their domains and governments; and the free exercise of their religion throughout the kingdom, with the exception of Paris. It proved but a deception, however; the Catholics immediately formed a combination denominated the League, a union of religionists and politicians, to restore the Catholic church to its su-

premacy and insure the continuance in the hands of that party of the government of the state, and led in 1577 to a renewal of the war, which proved disastrous to the Protestants, and after the fall of several of their towns, was terminated in September, by peace, and the edict of Poitiers, which gave them the liberty of conscience, the right of admission to public employments, and the exercise of their religion in all places where it was then professed. The League soon renewed their plots, and after a series of artifices and treacheries, in 1585, pledged themselves by the treaty of Nemours to fresh assaults on the Protestants, and soon commenced a war, during which Henry III., the king, became alarmed at the schemes of his own party, who used him as their tool, put several of the leaders to death, and among them the duke of Guise, the murderer of Coligny in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, formed an alliance with the king of Navarre to oppose the League, and finally fell a victim, August, 1589, to an assassin, employed by Guise's sister, and was succeeded in the throne by Henry IV., of Navarre, who in 1591 issued the first edict of Nantes, by which the Huguenots were confirmed on all the franchises that had been granted them by previous edicts. They were not, however, exempted from annoyance and persecution during the reign of that prince. In 1593, he abjured Protestantism and entered the Romish church, and the Catholics, availing themselves of the distracted state of the kingdom, soon renewed the work of persecution and massacre. In 1595, the leaguers attacked an assembly at Chataigneraie, while engaged in worship, and assassinated two hundred men, women, and children. The exercise of religion was interrupted in whole provinces, the Protestants were assailed in going to and returning from worship, and their lives endangered; cannon-shot were fired on their assemblies; individuals were seized, abused, and tortured; children were baptized by force by Catholic priests; bibles were burned; hostage towns were dismantled; and wrongs, insults, and outrages, heaped on them with impunity. Their remonstrances against these atrocities drew from the king, in April, 1598, an ordinance bearing the name of the Edict of Nantes, by which full liberty of conscience was granted, the public exercise of religion in all places where it was established in 1597, and in the faubourgs of the towns, the castles and

houses of noblemen, admission to public offices, schools, and hospitals, the right of printing their books in certain places, the establishment of certain academies, the convocation of synods, and the possession of certain towns as hostages; and during the remaining twelve years of Henry IV.'s reign they enjoyed the observance of their religion with few obstructions.

Machinations were resumed against them soon after the accession of his son, Louis XIII.; in 1617, the Catholic religion was formally established in the Bearne, where nearly the whole population were of the Reformed faith; troops were marched into the territory to enforce the decree; the churches were defaced, the Protestants insulted, abused, and pillaged; children were torn from their parents, and borne off to be educated by Catholics; the ministers were driven away; many of their flocks forced by blows to attend mass, and the country filled with robbery, outrage, and terror. This led the Protestants to resolve on defending themselves, and prompted the Catholics to fresh projects of exterminating them by the sword, the gibbet, and the faggot. After an unsuccessful siege of Montauban, the king withdrew his troops, and remitted the war till 1622, when it was re-commenced and prosecuted with a brutal ferocity. The prisoners were treated as rebels. Many were executed immediately; others were sent to the galleys. On the capture of the little town of Negrepelisse, the inhabitants were, without discrimination, massacred. Mothers who swam the river with their infants in their arms, were bayoneted on reaching the shore; and the garrison on capitulating were hanged. After having shed the blood of great numbers and desolated several provinces, peace was concluded, and the privileges of the Edict of Nantes again confirmed to the Protestants. It was soon followed, however, by fresh outrages, which finally, in 1627, led to another war, and the siege of Rochelle, which, after its inhabitants had endured the most dreadful extremes of famine, and sank by thousands to the grave, fell in October, 1628, into the hands of the Catholics. In May, 1629, the town of Privas was captured, eight hundred Huguenot soldiers who had capitulated were massacred, fifty of the citizens were hanged, the rest sent to the galleys, and the town given up to pillage and conflagration. With these

misfortunes the resistance of the Protestants terminated, and the king in July issued an edict of pardon.

From 1629 to 1661 the Protestants enjoyed comparative tranquillity. On the death, in that year, of cardinal Mazarin, Louis XIV., under the promptings of the Catholic clergy, resumed the project of forcing them into the Romish church, exterminating them, or driving them into exile; and after issuing many ordinances, by which their privileges, guaranteed by the edict of Nantes, were taken away, and subjecting them to innumerable annoyances, threats, and outrages, through twenty years, stripping them of their property, robbing them of their children, and driving great numbers of them into exile, to escape the destruction which impended over them, he, in 1681, commenced the infamous dragoonades, or attempt to drive them to submission or destruction, by quartering soldiers on their families. From four to six men were lodged in each house, with orders not to kill the inmates, but to use whatever violence and outrage they pleased to induce them to abjure their religion. Released from all restraint, and encouraged to wreak on them their brutal passions, the soldiers perpetrated the most frightful atrocities. They subjected them to the most exorbitant and lawless exactions; they robbed them of their property; the men were stabbed, tortured, and driven to the churches to attend mass; the women were insulted, beaten, disfigured, outraged, dragged by the hair, and threatened with death; children were subjected to the most cruel abuse, and, in many instances, forced by violence and terror to abjure, and their abjuration made a reason for withdrawing them from their parents to be educated as Catholics. Under these horrible inflictions, great numbers perished. Multitudes, to escape them, fled to the forests for shelter, or concealed themselves in the houses of their friends; while thousands of families abandoned the country, and fled to Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, and England. To prevent their emigration, ordinances were issued against fugitives, condemning heads of families to the galleys for life, and those who encouraged them to heavy fines, and rendering all sale of their property, during the year preceding the flight, nugatory. As the work of outrage and torture advanced, still more summary measures were em-

towns were half deserted, and vast tracts of land were left without cultivators. The whole number who emigrated is estimated by some writers at only three, four, or five hundred thousand. Antoine Court, one of the pastors, places it at eight hundred thousand. The number that perished by the bayonet, in prisons, in the galleys, and on the scaffold, ere the persecution closed, soon after the accession of Louis XVI., is estimated by Sismondi at between three and four hundred thousand. The whole number of victims, in these various forms, during the hundred and twenty-five years that followed the commencement of the dragoonades, may be placed, without danger of excess, at from a million and a quarter to a million and a half; while the number besides who, remaining in France, felt during that period the terror of the persecution and its remorseless cruelties, was not less, there is reason to believe, than from three to four millions.

Though the brutal measures of the court continued to be pursued, the pastors were driven off, and the churches destroyed, yet many of the Protestants who had been forced into a feigned submission to the Romish church soon recovered from their terror, and began to hold assemblies in secluded places, in the deserts, and on the mountains, and to encourage each other to reprofess, and live, and die, in the Protestant faith; and a few of their pastors, who had fled, returned and became their teachers. This inflamed the king and court with new frenzy. Death was denounced on all pastors who re-entered the kingdom; large rewards were promised to those who should seize them; while such as should conceal and succor them, were sentenced to the galleys for life. A war was commenced against the assemblies. Troops were employed to scour the country. When the Protestants were discovered engaged in worship, they were fired upon, and such as could be reached consigned to destruction. Unarmed, they only attempted to save themselves by flight; and when unable to escape, waited death on their knees, encouraging each other, raising their hands to heaven, and commending themselves to God. In some of those massacres, two, three, or four hundred men, women, and children, were put to the sword. This murderous crusade was waged without intermission for near twenty years, and

terminated in the war of the Camisards, who, in 1702, attempted to repel their murderers by force, and maintained a desperate conflict till overpowered in 1704. The tragedies of this period surpass, if possible, those that had preceded them. Besides the crowds that were slaughtered in the deserts and on the mountains, the prisons were gorged, the galleys were crowded, and a vast train of martyrs were consigned to the rack, the gibbet, the block, and the flames. Among them, besides a large number of preachers, were seventeen pastors. The meekness, patience, and heroism displayed by them generally, have never been transcended by the witnesses of Jesus.

After the submission of the Camisards, the Protestants continued to hold their assemblies in the mountains and deserts, and the crusade was continued against them, until 1724, when Louis XV. issued a new edict, by which they were divested of all their remaining rights, and exposed to fresh atrocities. Massacres, imprisonments, tortures, executions, continued through the next forty years.

It is computed that in three years, from 1744 to 1746, three hundred persons were condemned to the scourge, to degradation from nobility, to imprisonment, to the galleys, and to death, by the single parliament of Grenoble. Besides these inflictions, immense sums were extorted as fines. Other provinces were the scene of similar barbarities. This ferocious war at length reached its climax in the tragedies at Aigues Mortes and at Toulouse, in the execution of the last of the martyrs,—Rochette, and the three brothers Grenier, in February, and the aged Calas in March, 1762, as related in the Priest and the Huguenot, vol. ii.

From this period the Protestants, though in fact outlawed, suffered but few annoyances; and at the approach of the Revolution, in 1787, an edict of toleration was signed by Louis XVI., by which their legal existence was recognised, and they were freed from persecution. Two years after, in 1789, the Constituent Assembly raised them to an equality in political rights with all other citizens: the Constitution of 1793 guaranteed to them the free exercise of their worship; and in 1802 they were nationalized by Napoleon, and the salaries of the pastors paid from the public treasury.

Scarcely, however, had Louis XVIII. resumed the throne

after the final fall of Bonaparte, in 1815, ere a war was commenced on the Protestants of the south of France by mobs of assassins, and with the knowledge and by the connivance of the government. A rabble of Catholic cut-throats attacked the garrison at Nismes, consisting of about two hundred Protestant soldiers, and, after their capitulation, massacred nearly the whole in cold blood. They then proceeded to attack the Protestant inhabitants, and pillage, outrage, and murder reigned throughout the city, and the neighbouring country, for a number of months. Houses were sacked, property destroyed, the helpless brutally abused and assassinated, women outraged, tortured, and murdered,—and those who attempted to defend themselves, were arraigned before the tribunals, and condemned and executed as criminals. Similar atrocities were perpetrated throughout Languedoc and the Vaucluse; besides those who were murdered, many were thrown into prisons, great numbers were driven to the mountains and deserts for safety: and finally, a scheme was formed for a general massacre. After months of outrage and terror, the court was at length induced by the remonstrances of the English and Prussian governments, and the fear of a bloody civil war with which it was threatened, to take effective steps to put an end to the crusade. It was not till near the close of 1816,—eight hundred years from the first martyrdom at Orleans,—that apprehensions were allayed, and peace restored to the Protestants. Since that time, though subjected to many annoyances, they have not been surrendered to the knife of the assassin, stretched on the rack, nor consigned to the gibbet or fire.

Such is a brief history of the persecuting career of that merciless tigress—the Catholic church of France—through eight centuries of her domination in that country. Such are the expedients,—the most brutal and fiendish outrages, torture, murder, massacre, extermination by fire and sword,—which she has employed to stifle the voice of God's true worshippers, and hush them into eternal silence. No other power ever perpetrated such a series of atrocious crimes; no other monster ever wrung the human heart with such agonies; no other ever drank such seas of blood.

And her spirit remains unchanged. Instead of relinquishing her ambition, she is resuming her schemes of universal

empire, and preparing again to ply her instruments of torture, and rekindle the fires of martyrdom: and she intends, when she next puts the knife to the throat of her enemies, it shall not drink the life of European Protestants alone: the vengeance she threatens, is to have its day in this hemisphere also; our streets are to be deluged with the blood of their peaceful inhabitants, and the hills and vales of this wide land resound with the shrieks of her victims. There is not a city, a town, or a village from the Atlantic to the Rocky Mountains, the Catholic population of which is not familiarized by the priests with this diabolical purpose, and taught to look forward to the time when they shall wreak their ferocious passions without stint on their Protestant neighbors, and enact the tragedies of outrage and slaughter which have been the pastime and boast of their co-religionists in the old world for more than a thousand years. But her triumph will be short. Her next crusade is to be her last; and is to be followed by her own retribution. The shout of avenging nations will soon doom her to the destruction with which she has so long menaced others: "Reward her, even as she has rewarded you," with the knife, the bayonet, the gibbet, and the stake; "And double unto her double, according to her works. In the cup which she hath filled," with outrage, tears, and horrors, "fill to her double." "And her plagues shall come in a day, death, and mourning, and famine," and "fire," and shall sweep her with the besom of extermination, that not a trace of her shall remain.

The reward of the martyrs of Jesus who have fallen by her hand, is also rapidly approaching. How changed will be the spectacle on the morning of the first resurrection, when the chariot of the Almighty Redeemer, mounting up the eastern sky of France, shall flash effulgence over the cities and plains, the vales and mountains, where they sleep, and, summoned by his voice, they shall rise from their graves in the majesty of immortals, cast their first glances around the scenes of the tortures and slaughters which they suffered for his sake, and ascending the skies through which they looked up in their last struggles, and breathed their last accents, join his countless train, and enter on the raptures of an endless life of peace, of sanctitude, and of bliss; while their persecutors are left under an irrepealable curse, still to

moulder in their sepulchres, and people the realms of despair!

ART. VI.—HISTORY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH, with a General Introduction to Church History. By Philip Schaff, Professor in the Theological Seminary at Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. Translated by Edward D. Yeomans, New York. Charles Scribner. 1853.

BY THE EDITOR.

THIS is the first of a series of eight or nine volumes, which Professor Schaff proposes on the history of the church. It opens with a general introduction to the subject, in which he treats at length of the usual topics of such an essay, presenting his idea, first, of history, and next, of the church and of its development; or, in other words, his philosophic theory of God, of man, and of the church, which lies at the basis of his work, and is the medium through which he contemplates the Christian system, and the great facts of its history; its growth; its changes of doctrine; its variations and multiplication of rites; the new forms which its government has assumed; the arrogation by its rulers of legislative and monarchical powers; its persecution of dissentients; its superstitions, idolatries, and profligacy; its reformations; and, finally, the fluctuations, contests, and catastrophes that have marked the two great communions—Catholic and Protestant—into which the western churches have been divided during the last three hundred and fifty years.

He next proceeds to the sources of church history; the proper method of writing it, and the periods into which it should be divided. In respect to the last, instead of years, like Baronius, or centuries like Flacius and Mosheim, he proposes three great stages, each of which is divided into three subordinate periods that are distinguished by some peculiar feature. The first extends to the accession of Gregory the Great, and comprises the apostolic age from A D. 30 to 100; next, the age of Pagan persecution, from 100 to the legalization of Christianity by Constantine in 311; and, thirdly, the age of the nationalized church from 311 to Gre-

gory the Great in 590, which is the year preceding the nationalization of the Roman church by the Lombards. The second period extends from 590 to the Reformation in 1517, and is subdivided into the middle ages to the time of Hildebrand, 1049; next, the middle ages from 1049 to Boniface VIII., 1313; and, lastly, the two hundred and fourteen years from Boniface to 1517, during which preparations were making for the Reformation. The third period extends from the Reformation to the present time, and is divided into the age of the Reformation from 1517 to 1600; next, the age of confessions, from 1600 to 1750; and, finally, the period from 1750 to the present time, which he regards as preparatory to new developments or revolutions, and a final fusion of the Catholic and Protestant churches. These general divisions, which differ somewhat from those of Neander and Gieseler, are perhaps as appropriate as any others. The chief objection to them is, that they seem to contemplate a history of the western church only, after the accession of Gregory the Great to the papal throne. The history of the Greek or eastern church would naturally fall into a different division from its nationalization—as the age from Constantine to the conquest of the east by the Saracens, 311–636. Next from the conquests by the Saracens—the first apocalyptic woe—to the first incursions of the Turks, 636–1061; thirdly, the first period of the second woe, from the first incursion of the Turks to the fall of Constantinople, 1061–1453; and, lastly, the remaining period of the second woe, from the fall of that capital to the present time. Those great periods have been as broadly distinguished to the eastern, as those of the middle ages and the Reformation have been to the western church.

After characterizing, according to his philosophical notions, these different ages of the church, he presents a chapter on the works that have been written on its history. This topic, which is wholly omitted by Mosheim and Neander, and but slightly treated by Gieseler, occupies the larger portion of the introduction, and is much its most attractive and valuable part. He divides the church historians into those of the Patristic period, those of the middle ages, and those of the Catholics and the Protestants since the Reformation. Instead of a mere catalogue of authors, or the titles of their works, he gives their characteristics, and generally, as far as

we are acquainted with them, with a good share of discrimination and impartiality.

He opens his history of the apostolic church also, to which the remainder of the volume is devoted, with an introduction, in which, like Mosheim, Neander, Gieseler, and others, he treats of the condition of the world at the institution of the church, the state of heathenism, of Judaism, and of philosophy, and of the aids and the obstacles which, according to his theory of man, they presented to the spread of Christianity. From this theme he passes to the proper history of the apostolic church, treating in succession of its founding, spread, and persecution; of its moral and religious life; of its worship, of its government, and of its doctrine and theology. These subjects, with a variety of subordinate topics, are distributed into separate books, and are nearly the same as those treated by Neander in his History of the Planting and Training of the Church. Though presenting little of novelty, they are, with the exception of the philosophy that pervades them, handled in a manner highly creditable to Professor Schaff as a scholar and a narrator. The style is clear, vigorous, and sufficiently ornate; the narrative simple, direct, and graphic; the delineations of character, though in a measure fanciful, are generally discriminating, and rise in some instances to elegance. Many of the views he presents of Christianity itself are just and impressive; and he exhibits throughout the work ample evidences of ability—were he disenthralled from the shackles of a false philosophy—to produce a history of superior merit, and that would prove a rich blessing to the church.

No finer theme can be desired by a mind even of the largest gifts and most comprehensive attainments, for the display of all the powers of intellect and fancy, and all the stores of learning; and in a large measure in forms sufficiently original and novel. And a new history of the Christian world, such as a true historic genius might elaborate, is greatly needed, and would meet an ardent welcome from all branches of the Protestant church. None of the works hitherto produced, rise to the beau-ideal of a history of Christianity. Mosheim's has great merits, especially considering the period when it was written. The picture he presents is generally eminently correct; a sketch of the great series of

actors and events in which their chief features are presented, with truth and distinctness; but it is only a sketch, and far too devoid of drapery and coloring. Neander's also has many high merits. He was very thoroughly master of the original sources from which the materials of the history are to be drawn, and with the auxiliaries furnished by recent investigations; and generally presents a minute and faithful picture of the facts which he attempts to describe. He is not, however, a skilful narrator; he exhibits little tact in grouping his pictures; his delineations are often careless and unartistic, and his style involved and cumbrous; and what is far more objectionable, not content with a just description of personages, and recital of events, he usually presents, at almost equal length, a second delineation of them as he contemplates them through the medium of his philosophy of God and man and the church, that is in great part a sheer work of imagination, a mere projection of himself on his page, or exhibition of the speculative notions, the principles, and feelings under which he presumes he should have acted, had he stood in the place of those whose character and agency he is describing. These defects will naturally debar his work from the general circulation it would otherwise enjoy, and will cause it to be neglected, in a measure, by the great body of readers whenever another equalling it in other respects, and free from these faults, shall be produced. Gieseler's work is invaluable from the immense mass of quotations and references to authorities which it presents; but it is designed for those only who are familiar with Greek and Latin, not for general readers.

There is an urgent need, therefore, of a new history; and the subject, so far from being exhausted, offers a splendid theatre for the loftiest and most varied powers,—an ample field for new and original groupings, and fresh and vivid delineations. A history is wanted in which there shall not only be a sketch of the chief personages, and a recital of the principal events, but a fuller portraiture of the leading actors in the great scene, and a more minute and life-like picture, on the one hand, of the domestic habits, the social character, the stern principles, the unbending fidelity, the lofty heroism of the sufferers especially, for Christ, in the persecutions which form a large part of the history of God's people for

eighteen hundred years; and on the other, of the debasement, the treachery, the cruelty, and the malice of their calumniators, torturers, and slaughterers. No one who studies the history of the church in the original works in which it is recorded, can fail to be struck with the fact that every considerable period has been marked by the presence of great and commanding minds, that, in their sphere, were, to their contemporaries and successors, what the greatest intellects, in the most conspicuous and authoritative positions of modern times, have been to theirs;—men who stamped their image on their age, and transmitted a vast influence to the generations that followed them. Such—to say nothing of Clemens of Alexandria, of Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and a crowd of others of secondary rank—such were Origen, Athanasius, Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Beringer, Hildebrand, Anselm, Abelard, Bernard, Thomas Aquinas, Wickliff, and many others in the ages that followed. A just portraiture of these extraordinary men, a full picture of the several ages in which they flourished, and an accurate delineation of the vast effects that sprang from their agency, undoubtedly demands a genius and skill of the highest order; while there are innumerable scenes in which Christians as a body had a part, such especially as the persecution at Lyons in the second century, at Alexandria and Carthage in the third, and through the eastern empire generally, in the early part of the fourth, that present the finest subjects for lofty and effective delineation. No spectacles were ever presented to the historic pencil that transcend them at once in awfulness, on the one hand, or beauty and sublimity, on the other. Whoever shall recall these great scenes and actors, and invest them with their living coloring; whoever shall set forth the truth respecting them in its genuine character, distinguish it from the counterfeits which have been substituted in its place, and vindicate it from the enemies with which it has had to contend, will be sure of an ample crowd of spectators, and confer a lasting benefit on the church and world.

Is Professor Schaff likely to render this important service to our literature? We much regret that we are obliged to say, we think not. Not that he has not a largely gifted mind: not that he is not a highly accomplished scholar in

this sphere: not that portions of the present volume are not written with adequate originality, judgment, spirit, and elegance;—but simply because, instead of contenting himself with writing *a history* solely of the church, consisting as it has and does of *human beings*, wholly separate in their nature from God, dependent on him for existence, and subject to his providential and moral government,—he has chosen, after the pattern of Neander, and other late writers of that school, to mix with his history *a philosophy* of God, of man, and of the church, in wholly unreal, unnatural, and impossible relations; which contradicts all the great truths of the Christian system and facts of church history, and involves him in endless and fatal inconsistencies and self-confutations. That philosophy is the pantheistic theory of Schelling, consisting of three great elements. First, the identity of God and the universe, especially man. It teaches that God is the only real entity or being; that he originally existed as the Absolute, in an altogether inactive, undeveloped, and unconscious state; that he passed from that state into activity and consciousness by assuming the finite material and psychical forms of the universe, and especially of men; that the universe, in all its parts, is identically the same entity, therefore, as God was in the condition of the Absolute, and differs only in that he now exists in innumerable finite forms; that he is conscious only as he exists in finite intelligences; and that his whole consciousness is thence identically the same as the sum total of the consciousness of all finite minds; that men accordingly are parts of God, and that the sum total of men—for Schelling speculates as though there were no other moral beings—is the sum total of God, as an intelligence. Secondly, that the law by which he unfolds himself and acts in men, is that of the theory of development, which represents that all the thoughts, affections, and acts of mankind, and especially of the church, are his thoughts, affections, and acts, and revelations and expressions of his will, and consequently, that the doctrines, faith, rites, worship, and practice of the church of every successive period, have embodied the substance and formed a true expression of the genuine Christianity of those periods. And thirdly, that the knowledge of this identity of God and the universe, and of the law by which he acts in

the church, and developes himself, and modifies Christianity, is obtained, not like other knowledge, by external media, but by direct intuition.

In this philosophy, accordingly, Professor Schaff has wholly stept out of his sphere, as an historian of the church,—consisting as it does of mere human beings, entirely separate, as entities, from each other and from God, and dissimilar from him in nature and mode of existence, and enters on a totally different theatre, where he contemplates them as another species of entities, parts of an infinite self-existence, and of a nature, therefore, of which we have no consciousness. Consequently, in this philosophy, he undertakes to account for the views, faiths, worship, and various acts of the church, and the changes that have taken place in them, *not by the powers and affections of our proper humanity*, under the physical and moral influences to which we are consciously subjected, but by a wholly different and a divine nature, of which we are wholly unconscious, and acting under powers altogether different from the physical and moral influences that affect our senses, our intellects, our emotions, our passions, and our wills. And finally, the media through which, according to the theory, the knowledge of this nature, and the power that actuates it, is derived, instead of our natural faculties, is *a direct vision of God*, of which we also are altogether unconscious, and supersedes, therefore, so far as his philosophy is concerned, the New Testament, and the writings of the Fathers, and other monuments of the patristic period, of the middle ages, and of modern times, which, in *his Introduction*, he represents as the sole source from which the materials of the history of the church are to be derived.

Instead of a single history then, founded on the literary grounds which he presents in his introduction as its proper basis, he in fact proposes a double one, or a history in two spheres—the first of which is a philosophical one, being wholly out of the domain of our consciousness, and offering a total contradiction to our nature, the causes that affect us, and our agency, and necessarily, therefore, altogether false; and as necessarily contorting and adulterating the other, by construing its acts and occurrences by its own principles, and a perpetual infusion into it of its unnatural and ab-

surd errors. A work so unphilosophical, so uncritical, so false, and preposterous, whatever powers may elaborate it, cannot be the beau-ideal of a church history; and cannot meet the necessities, and command the acceptance of the evangelical community.

That those are the doctrines of Schelling's philosophy which he makes the basis of his history, we have already shown in the Reviews of Nevin, Schaff, and Bunsen—Vol. V., pp. 636–688; Vol. VI., pp. 146–166, pp. 853–880. Instead of repeating the proofs of it, therefore, at large, we shall content ourselves with quoting the views that are presented of it by Tennemann and Hamilton. Thus Tennemann says:—

"The leading propositions of this theory are: 1st—That there exists but *one* identical nature; and that merely a quantitative—not a qualitative—difference exists between objects, *quoad essentiam*, resulting from the preponderance of the objective, or subjective,—the ideal, or real. The finite has only an *apparent* existence, inasmuch as it is the product of merely relative reflection. 2d.—The one Absolute Nature reveals itself in the eternal generation of existing things, which on their part constitute the forms of the first. Consequently, *each individual being is a revelation of Absolute Being* in a determinate form. Nothing can exist which does not participate in the divine Being. Consequently, the natural world is not *dead*, but *animated and divine*, no less than the ideal. 3d.—This revelation of the Absolute takes place in conformity with certain correlative oppositions, which characterize different gradations of development, with a preponderance of the real or the ideal, and which consequently are nothing more than so many expressions of absolute identity."

"The theory of Schelling is remarkable for the originality of the views it contains, the magnitude of the problems it would solve, the consistency of its plan, and the vast circle of its application. It binds together by one single idea all the essences of nature, removing the limits which had been assigned by Kant to the dominion of science, and asserting the possibility not only of a subjective apprehension, but of an *objective* and scientific knowledge,—of a certain and determinate *perception* of God and divine things, by virtue of *the identity between the human mind and the essence of all Being.* It embraces the whole circle of philosophical speculation, removing as it does *the distinction* between *empirical and rational knowledge*; and *its principles are made applicable to all the sciences.* It has the appearance, however, of being—First, as relates to *practical* science, very confined and embarrassed; nor can we discover how, in such a

system of *Absolute Identity*, there can be room for practical necessity, or in other words, *the obligation of duty*. The theory is characterized by a blind sort of *natural necessity* and Determinism—God reveals himself of necessity: all history, and all the mutations of the world, are but the modifications of his essence. Secondly. Independently of this partial view of nature, the system is deficient in the solidity of its principles. It is not shown in what manner the human mind can elevate itself to the intellectual contemplation described: the principles, therefore, laid down are mere suppositions. *Thought*, without a *thinking subject*, is nothing better than an abstract idea. Absolute Identity is inconceivable, independent of Relative Identity. Without the latter, the former is reduced to a mere nonentity. . . 4th.—Can any one presume to believe that the inscrutable nature of the Godhead is contained in the idea of Absolute Identity? His natural philosophy conveys to us no knowledge of God, and the little it reveals appears opposed to religion. It becomes a system of PANTHEISM, by identifying the Deity with nature, and makes the Deity himself subject to superior laws, supposing him obliged to reveal himself, and making the Divinity, as intelligence, proceed within the compass of time, from non-intelligent principles, —nature in the Deity and chaos. The Deity is supposed to render *passive* a certain portion of his nature with which before he energized, and, to enable us to conceive of him as a *personal* being, we are obliged to suppose the existence in him of nature as a negative essence. God is represented, not as a Divine Being, but as LIFE. Now life pre-supposes a certain destiny, and *implies passive affections and a gradual development;* and to such limitations we are taught to believe that the Deity has voluntarily submitted himself. The whole theory is nothing better than an ingenious fiction, which, by offering the appearance of a solution of all difficulties, and by its pretended construction of Nature, proved generally attractive: *as well as by removing all idea of constraint or moral obligation*—by suggesting a variety of new ideas, and by appearing to throw open a wide perspective to the views of science."—Hist. Phil., pp. 442–449.]

Schelling's philosophy is thus a mere system of pantheism. A history, consequently, written on the ground of it must be false, just in proportion as it is consistent with itself; inasmuch as it must exhibit men as divine instead of human, or as creatures,—must represent all their affections and acts as divine;—and thence, must maintain that all the false faiths, superstitions, impious rites, and polluted and cruel actions of the church are legitimate and holy, and form a true ex-

pression of the religion of Christ at their several periods; and just in proportion as it fails of that representation, it deserts its own principles, and confounds and nullifies itself.

And it is on this philosophy that Professor Schaff proceeds in his history. This is seen, not from his formally avowing it—for it is not asserted by him in so many words, though he presents the most ample evidences that he entertains it, and makes it the basis of his work—directly to announce it was not necessary, nor was it politic;—but from the high encomiums he pronounces on Schelling, Hegel, and Schleiermacher, who are pantheists; his use of the peculiar phraseology of the system; and, finally, his zealous adoption of the theory of development, which is an element of it, and is tenable only on its ground. Thus, in his Principle of Protestantism, after representing that a great revolution has taken place in Germany during the last fifty years, from rationalism and infidelity to faith in God and Christianity, he refers it in a great measure to the influence of Schelling's and Hegel's philosophy:—

"A second powerful agent in the production of the change which has been mentioned, is presented to us in the modern philosophy since the rise of SCHELLING. He freed German science, and with it theology also, from the bonds of Kant's stand-point of reflection, and Fichte's subjective idealism, and led forth the spirit again into the objective world, both of nature and history. Speak as men may against German transcendentalism—as the word passes here in a wholesale way—this at least no one acquainted with the subject can deny, that at the very time when the most celebrated theologians cast away the cardinal evangelical doctrines of the incarnation and atonement, as antiquated superstitions, SCHELLING and HEGEL stood forth in their defence, and claimed for them the character of the highest *reason*, and that while the reigning view saw in history only an aggregate of *arbitrary opinions*, a chaos of *selfish passions*, they taught the world to recognise in it *the ever opening sense of eternal thoughts* [that is, God's instead of man's], an always advancing rational *development of the idea of humanity* and its relations to God [that is, the idea that humanity and God are identically the same, or that all the forms that men assume, are finite forms of God]. Such a view must gradually overthrow the abrupt, revolutionary, and negative spirit which characterized the last century; *restoring respect for the church and its history*, and making room for the genuine power of the positive."—Pp. 149, 150.

The doctrines of incarnation and atonement which those philosophers reproduced, are such, of course, as consist with their pantheism, and are wholly different therefore from the incarnation and atonement taught in the Bible; and the respect for "the church and its history" which they have restored, contemplates them as their theories represent them. He ascribes to them the same agency in his present work.

"As the deistical or vulgar rationalism gained prevalence and power towards the end of the last century, by the co-operation of different causes and influences, so men of various callings and tendencies, as Herder, Hamann, Jacobi, the romantic school of Schlegel, Tieck and Novalis, *the philosophers* SCHELLING and HEGEL, and still more the theologian SCHLEIERMACHER, each did his part towards overthrowing its dominion in the scientific world, and preparing the way for *a new theology pervaded by the life of faith.*"—Pp. 86, 87.

That Schleiermacher, who had such a share in this reformation, was, as well as Hegel, a pantheist, he admits. In his notice of Neander, he says:

"In theology he was first a pupil of the gifted Schleiermacher, under whose electrifying influence he came during his University studies at Halle, and at whose side he afterwards stood as colleague for many years at Berlin. He always thankfully acknowledged the great merits of this German Plato, who, in a time of general apostasy from the truth, rescued so many young men from the iron embrace of rationalism, and led them at least to the threshold of the holiest of all. But he himself took a more positive course, rejecting the pantheistic and fatalistic elements which had adhered to the system of his master from the study of Spinoza, and which, it must be confessed, bring it *in a measure* into direct opposition to the simple gospel, and the old faith of the church. This was for him of the greatest moment. For only in the recognition of a personal God, and of the free agency of individual men, can history be duly apprehended and appreciated."—Pp. 96, 97. See also pp. 100, 101.

Though he thus faintly rejects the pantheism of Spinoza, and elsewhere that of an ultra class of the Hegelians, and represents Neander as rejecting them, he nowhere intimates that either he or Neander dissents from the differing pantheism of Schelling. And what was the peculiar philosophy of Schleiermacher, by which he "rescued so many young

men from the iron embrace of rationalism, and led them at least to the threshold of the holiest of all?" The pantheistic dogma—in opposition to rationalism, which denied the fact and possibility of revelation—that the divine and human reason are identically the same, and thence that all the acts of human reason are so many revelations of God's reason, and manifestations of his will; and consequently that the ideas of law, of duty, of sin, of a mediator, of an atonement, of a redemption, are divine ideas, and elements therefore of a genuine and authoritative natural religion—which, though reached by a different process, is identically the doctrine of Schelling.

He indicates his faith in the theory in many of his representations, and the perpetual use of its peculiar phraseology. Thus, in attempting to give a psychological explanation of the apostles' speaking with tongues on the day of Pentecost, he says:

"As to the general *nature* of this phenomenon: it is an involuntary spiritual utterance in an ecstatic state of the most elevated devotion, in which the man is not, indeed, properly transported out of himself, but rather sinks into the inmost depths of his own soul, and *thus into direct contact with* THE DIVINE ESSENCE WITHIN HIM; in which state, however, for this very reason, his ordinary consciousness of himself and the world, and with it his common mode of speaking, is suspended, and he is controlled entirely by the consciousness of God, and becomes an involuntary organ of the objective Spirit of God which fills him."—P. 199.

The philosophy of the miracle thus is, according to him, that "*the divine essence*" within the person who spoke with tongues, was roused by the action of the Holy Spirit on it, into such activity as to suspend and extinguish his ordinary consciousness of himself as a finite and human being, and raise him to a divine consciousness, or *exercise and feeling of the attributes of God, as his own.* It assumes and represents, therefore, that a part of "the divine essence" was *subjective* in those in whom the miracle was wrought, and formed the basis of their being, in contradistinction from another part of the divine essence, denominated the Holy Spirit, which was *objective* to them, and acted on their subjective divine essence; and as the divine essence, which he holds was subjective in those who spake with tongues, he regards—not as

peculiar to them—but as existing equally in all other individuals of the race: it shows that he regards a part of the divine essence as subjective in each individual, and the basis of his nature; and that is the identical doctrine of pantheism. Obscure, mystical, and contradictious indeed, as his representation is, there is no other theory from which it could have sprung.

He discloses this pantheistic notion with equal clearness in the following passage :—

"The Christology of the church conceives the union of the divine and human natures in the Redeemer as something already *accomplished, a finished fact.* This is the *theological* way of viewing it. But with this there is also *a historical and ethical view*, which *coincides in its result* with the other, but at the same time *forms its necessary complement.* This regards *the union* ["of the divine and human natures"] in its progress, its development, *as a perpetually growing* INCARNATION OF GOD AND DEIFICATION OF MAN. These two processes condition each other, and are simultaneously completed, since they are *one* (not identical). Just so far as *the divine* forms itself in the various stages and conditions of human existence, *the latter is deified, and vice versâ.*" Note,—p. 435.

Here the divine nature is represented as being incarnate in all who are sanctified, as truly as it is in Christ himself, and in precisely the same way. But the divine nature is a part of Christ's complex person, not a mere "objective" agent that acts in him. It is a part, therefore, according to Professor Schaff, of the persons of all those who are redeemed by Christ; and that is the identical doctrine of pantheism.

He reveals the theory also, as the basis of his history, in the continual use of its peculiar technical or cant terms, such as "the divine in man," "the consciousness of God," "the life of Christ" and of "God" in "believers," in "the church" and in "humanity." By "the divine in man" is meant "the divine essence within him," or the acts which it exerts; not simply something that is conformed to God's will, or that resembles him in sanctitude. By "the consciousness of God" is meant a consciousness of him as *subjective*, and a part of one's nature; and a direct "*intuition*" of him as such, and as existing objectively also. This is the only sense the term can bear. We are conscious of nothing

but our own operations. To be conscious of God, would be to see and feel directly that he is identical with ourselves; or that it is he that acts in us, and that the divine essence which is subjective in us, is a part of the same infinite divine essence that is objective also to us. Thus he represents the psychological condition of those who spake with tongues, as being "the highest power [state] of *intuition*, the immediate consciousness of God, in distinction from the understanding, that is the intellectual [or finite] consciousness, reflection." —P. 199.

But that he entertains this philosophic system, is placed beyond debate by his adoption—as the basis of his history—of the theory of development which is an element of Schelling's pantheism. That theory is, that the church at large, or the whole body of believers, past, present, and future, are to be considered as one person, or as having an organic union with each other, in much the same manner as the faculties or members of an individual have, and that they constitute a regenerated humanity of a nature like that of Christ in which the divine is embodied in the human; that Christ transfuses into that organic body his own divine life; and lives in it as he lives in his own; that the church, therefore, passes through different stages of life from infancy to childhood, from youth to mature age, and from one degree of maturity to another, and is finally to advance to full manhood, or complete perfection; and, consequently, that all the thoughts, faiths, rites, worships, and practices of the church at the several stages of its progress, are the genuine evolutions of its proper divine life; and true exponents and exemplifications of Christianity itself at those stages of its existence. The principle of this organism, life, and development, he represents as the same as that of an animal or a plant. As a plant or tree has a nature of its own that distinguishes it from all others, and as its growth is an evolution of that nature, and its root, stock, branches, leaves, flowers, and fruit, at the several periods of its progress, are developed from its original germ, and the natural and proper consequences of its peculiar constitution; and as an animal passes through a series of changes, from birth to old age, that are the necessary results and evolutions of the peculiar constitution with which it is endowed; so the church, he holds, is subject to a

like law of life, growth, and evolution of ideas, beliefs, affections, and acts, that are the natural and legitimate development of its peculiar constitution; and that those faiths, worships, affections, and acts are, at every stage of its existence, the genuine and only Christianity of those periods. Thus he says, in his Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development:

"The main point is to set in proper light the idea of *organic development*, since this forms the key to the understanding of *history*. . . . . *Subjective* Christianity, or the life of the God-man in his church, is a process, a development, which begins small, and grows always larger till it comes at last to full manhood in Christ; that is, till the believing human world may have appropriated to itself, both outwardly and inwardly, the entire fullness of *objective* Christianity, or the life of Christ. . . . We maintain consequently, that the Spirit of Christ himself, uninterruptedly present in the church, is *the chief factor in history*, to whose power all human factors, which are also to be acknowledged in their places, must be regarded as subordinate; and that *nothing which has ever once come to be of true historical weight* can be absolutely negated, or made to become null, but *must ever incorporate itself as an abiding element in the subsequent part of the process.*

"What, then, are we to understand by *organic or regular development*, in itself considered? And how is the general idea to be applied to the history of the church?"—Pp. 80–83.

This organic development, he states, is that which takes place in "the sphere of organic nature, in the life of the plant," of "the animal," and especially of man as a material existence.

"Man exists as an embryo. . . After his birth he makes the course of childhood, boyhood, youth, manhood, old age. In all these stages he is *man*, and preserves thus in his development the unity of his nature; but in all at the same time he is again different, inasmuch as his general nature takes continually *a more definite form, and reveals itself in a higher and more perfect way.* Still, even the highest stage, the life of the old man, is but the full evolution of the life that was originally present in the child. *This development we denominate regular and organic*, since it follows *with necessity an inward life force*, proceeds with equal steady order, and continues always *true to the original nature of the man*, till, in the end, it has brought the whole fulness of it into view. . . . .

"Parallel precisely with the bodily life of man in this view, is the life also of his spirit. . . . . spiritual growth or development is likewise a process, ... in which it comes, in the end, to a complete explication only of what was present by implication at the start. This must be affirmed even of the development of the life of religion itself."—Pp. 84–86.

And this process of growth and evolution, he holds, is the process of the organic development of Christianity and the church. "What holds true of the individual," he says, "must hold also of humanity as a whole, since this is simply the organic totality of all single men."

"The development of the church is *organic*. It is no mechanical accumulation of events, and no result simply of foreign influences. Certain outward conditions are, indeed, required for it, as the plant needs air, moisture, and light, in order to grow. But still the impelling force in the process is, *the inmost life of the church herself. Christianity* is a new creation, *that unfolds itself continually more and more from within, and extends itself by the necessity of its own nature.* It takes up, it is true, *foreign material* also, in the process; but changes it at once *into its own spirit*, and *assimilates it to its own nature*, as the body converts the food required for its growth into flesh and blood, marrow and bone. The church, accordingly, in this development, remains true always to her own nature, and reveals only what it contained in embryo from the start. Through all changes,—first Greek, then Roman Catholic, then German evangelical,—she never ceases still to be the church. So the oak also changes, but never becomes an apple tree. The expression *organic* implies further, that the stages of development, like the links of a chain, or better, like the members of a living body, are indissolubly bound together. Just because the church does unfold itself from within, as now affirmed, obeying its own life-law throughout, the process itself must form a whole, in which the several parts mutually complete each other. It is only the entire history of the church, from her commencement in the congregation at Jerusalem to her consummation in the general judgment, which can fully represent her conception. Here, however, will be found no trait superfluous, no trait wanting, and every part in its proper place, as is required by the nature of a beautiful and complete organization."—P. 91.

And this is the view which he advances in the present work, and makes the basis of his history:—

"The church is not to be viewed as a thing at once finished and perfect, but as an historical fact, as a human society, subject to the laws of history,—to genesis, growth, development. * * * All created life,—even the vegetable, and especially animal and human life,—though always in substance the same, is essentially motion, process, constant change, unceasing transition from the lower to the higher. Every member of the body, every faculty of the soul, exists at first merely potentially or virtually, and attains its full proportions only by degrees; just as the tree grows from the germ, unfolding first the root and trunk, then the branches, leaves, blossoms, and fruit. The same law holds in the case of the new man in Christ. * * * As the church is the organic whole of individual believers, it must likewise be conceived as subject to the same law of development; or, to use the expressive figure of the Saviour, as a grain of mustard seed, which grows at last to a mighty tree, overshadowing the world. The church, therefore, like every individual Christian, and, indeed, like Christ himself in his human nature, must be viewed, in her historical form, as having her infancy, her childhood, her youth, and her mature age. * * * * *

"The growth of the church is, in the first place, an outward extension over the earth. * * * In the second place, it consists in *an inward unfolding* of the idea of the church, in *doctrine, life, worship, and government;* the human nature, in all its parts, coming more and more to bear the impress of that new principle of life which has been given in Christ to *humanity*, and which is yet to transform the world into a glorious and blessed kingdom of God. * *

"This development, moreover, is *organic.* * * * It is a process of life which springs from *within, from the vital energy implanted in the church*, and which remains, in all its course, identical with itself, as man, through all the stages of his life, continues man."—Pp. 9–11.

He accordingly represents it as the peculiar excellence of "modern German Historiography, over that of preceding periods," that it is written on the theory of organic development:—

"Its most prominent excellence as to *form* and method, we take to be its *scientific* structure, and that *spirited, life-like* mode of representation which springs from the idea of *organic development.* History is no longer viewed as a mere inorganic mass of names, dates, and facts, but as *spirit* and *life*, and, therefore, as process, motion, development, passing through various stages, ever rising to some higher state, yet always identical with itself, so that its end is but the full unfolding of its beginning. This makes church history,

then, appear as an *organism*, starting from the person of Jesus Christ, the creator and progenitor of a *new race;* perpetually spreading, both outwardly and inwardly; maintaining a steady conflict with sin and error, without and within; continually beset with difficulties and obstructions; yet, under the unfailing guidance of Providence, infallibly working towards an appointed end. This idea of organic development combines what was true in the notion of something permanent and unchangeable in church history, as held by both the Catholic and the old Protestant Orthodoxy, with the element of truth in the Rationalistic conception of motion and flow; and on such ground alone is it possible to understand fully and clearly the *temporal life of Christianity.* A permanent principle, without motion, stiffens into stagnation; motion, without a principle of permanence, is a process of dissolution. In neither can there properly be any *living history.* The conception of such a history is, that while it incessantly changes its form, never for a moment standing still, yet, through all its changes, it remains true to its own essence; never outgrows itself; incorporates into each succeeding stage of growth the results of the preceding; and thus never loses anything which was ever of real value.

"This idea of organic, steadily improving development of *humanity*, according to a wise, unalterable plan of Providence, is, properly speaking, as old as Christianity; meets us in many passages of the New Testament, and in occasional remarks of the early Fathers, such as Tertullian and Augustine, and was brought out, in the eighteenth century, with peculiar emphasis and freshness, by the genial Herder, in his 'Ideas of the Philosophy of the History of Humanity' (1784), so highly valued by the gifted historian of Switzerland, John von Müller. The more mature and philosophical conception of it, however, and the impulse which it gave to a deeper and livelier study of history, are due especially to the philosophy of Schelling, and still more of Hegel. With Hegel, *all life and thought* is, properly, development, or a process of *organic growth*, which he calls *Aufhebung;* that is, in the three-fold sense of this philosophical term so much used by him, 1, an abolition of the previous imperfect form, *tollere;* 2, a preservation of the essence, *conservare;* and, 3, an elevation of it to a higher stage of existence, *elevare.* Thus, as the child grows to be a man, his childhood is done away, his personal identity is preserved, and his nature raised to the stage of manhood. So, as Judaism passes into Christianity, its exclusive character, as a preparatory establishment, is lost, but its substance is transferred into the gospel, and by it completed. * * * *

"The general idea of development, however, takes very different forms from different stand-points, as faith, authority, freedom, nay,

even Christianity itself, are liable to *the most contradictory definitions.* How far apart, for example, are Neander and Baur, though both apprehends and represent church history as a process of life! How different again from both the Roman Catholic convert, Newman, who has likewise a theory of development of his own! Hegel's development, in the hands of his infidel followers, is, at bottom, merely an intellectual process of logical *thinking*, in which, in the end, the substance of the Christian life itself is lost. . . . *The right application of the theory of development depends altogether on having beforehand a right view of positive Christianity, and being rooted and grounded in it, not only in thought, but also in heart and experience.* With this preparation, a man may learn from *any philosophical system without danger*, on the principle of Paul, that all things are his. . . .

"But when this mode of viewing history is adopted, *it cannot fail to have its influence on the representation.* If history is *spirit and life*, and in fact, rational spirit, *the manifestation and organic unfolding of eternal divine ideas, its representation* must likewise be full of *spirit and life*—an *organic reproduction.* A mechanical and lifeless method, which merely accumulates a mass of learned material, however accurately, is no longer enough. The historian's object now is to comprehend truly the events, leading ideas, and prominent actors of the past, and to unfold them before the eyes of his readers, just as they originally stood; to know not only *what* has taken place, but also *how* it has taken place. The old pragmatic method, too, of referring things merely to accidental, subjective, and psychological causes and motives, has become equally unsatisfying. A higher pragmatism is now demanded, which has paramount regard to the objective forces of history; traces the *divine* connexion of cause and effect, and with reverential wonder searches out the plan of eternal wisdom and love."—Pp. 90–92.

The theory of organic development is thus a branch of the pantheistic philosophy of Schelling and Hegel; or rather is their pantheism itself—named from its supposed law, instead of its nature. This Professor Schaff admits, and in effect asserts, in stating that the "mature conception" of it, and "the impulse" which it has given to "the study of history, are due especially to the philosophy of Schelling, and still more of Hegel,"—as they are pantheists, and they both present it as expressing *the principle or law* on which the Absolute unfolds himself in the finite forms in which they hold he embodies himself in humanity. It is the very soul and life of their philosophy; not an independent and contra-

dictious theory. This Professor Schaff expressly asserts of Hegel: "With Hegel, *all life and thought* is properly development, or a process of organic growth." He asserts it equally also of Schelling. He says of both Schelling and Hegel: "While the reigning view saw in *history* only an aggregate of arbitrary opinions, a chaos of selfish passions, *they* taught the world to recognise in it *the ever opening sense of* ETERNAL THOUGHTS, an always advancing rational development of *the idea of humanity* and *its relations to God*."—Principle of Protestantism, p. 150. "The idea of humanity and its relations to God," of which "history," according to them, is an "always advancing rational development," is of course "the idea" presented by their philosophy, which is, that God and the universe, or humanity, are identical; or that men are God in finite forms; and that all their thoughts, affections, and actions, are so many revelations and manifestations of his "eternal thoughts."

Moreover, no philosophy but a purely pantheistic one, admits of a theory of organic development. If, as Schelling's philosophy teaches, there is but one being or essence in the whole circle of existence; and that essence in its original state, is God the absolute; and in its developed state, is the material and psychical universe—God developed and the universe being identical; then, as all mankind are parts of that single and undivided essence, though moulded into individual forms, it is clear that they, as an aggregate, constitute an organism;—that is, a substance that, though distributed into different members, like the parts of a tree or an animal, is still but one, and undivided, and forms a body that unfolds itself by a natural law, and taken together is a complete and *indissoluble* whole. But unless mankind consist in that manner of a single undivided essence, that has unfolded itself in their individual forms, as the germ of a tree unfolds itself in the several parts of which it consists—roots, trunk, branches, leaves, blossoms, fruit—at the several stages of its growth, then they are not an organism. If absolutely distinct and independent of each other, they are no more a single organism, form, or being, than the various individual trees of a particular species, though wholly separate from and independent of each other, are taken together a single organism—an individual tree. The supposition of

an absolute organic unity in the one case, is as solecistical as in the other. It is as certain therefore, from its nature, that a theory of organic development is a theory of pantheism, as it is that pantheism is a theory that God and the universe are the same, and that man is the divine essence embodied in finite forms; for that is the very definition of Professor Schaff's theory of the organic development of humanity, Christianity, and the church.

Against this it will be alleged, perhaps, that Professor Schaff expressly rejects and denounces pantheism as a fatal error of Baur, Strauss, and others. That, however, is a particular form of pantheism, or the theory of organic development held by a class of Hegelians whom he calls the Tubingen school, and the infidel followers of Hegel. He nowhere rejects the pantheism of Hegel himself, or Schelling. He states that "the general idea of development takes very different forms from different stand-points," that "Neander and Baur, though both apprehend and represent church history as a process of life"—that is as pantheistic, yet differ widely in the results which they deduce from the idea: that "Hegel's development, in the hands of his infidel followers, is at bottom merely an intellectual process of logical thinking"—without a personal God, or any intelligent agent whatever—"in which in the end, the substance of the Christian life itself is lost:" and he maintains that "*the right application of the theory of development depends altogether on having beforehand a right view of positive Christianity*, and being rooted and grounded in it, not only in thought but also in heart and experience;"—that is, in so many words—what he objects to in the Tubingen school, is, not that they hold Hegel's theory of organic development which contemplates God and the universe as identically the same, but that their view of the Absolute and the nature of his development, leads to a denial that God is a personal being, and that the Bible is a revelation from him, and gives a true account of him, and of the nature and origin of Christianity: that is, that *they* employ the theory to prove that the Christianity of the New Testament is *a fable*, instead of using it as Schelling, Hegel, Neander, and Schaff himself do, to account for the universe, its phenomena, and especially the facts of church history, according to *their view* of them, as *the result of a single prin-*

ciple. Instead of rejecting pantheism itself, therefore, he only rejects a certain phase of it which differs from his preconceptions, and a certain application of its principles, which, however, if the system has any truth in it, is indisputably legitimate, and overturns the whole foundation and superstructure of his church history. In like manner Chevalier Bunsen, in his Hippolytus, while denouncing in contemptuous and impassioned terms, the pantheistic infidelity of Strauss, Baur, and others of the Tubingen school, advances, in the most open manner, as his own theory, the pantheistic system of Schelling, and devotes a large share of his work, as is shown in our notice of it in the Journal of January last, to the statement and support of its doctrines.

This pantheistic element, pervading thus as it does and will the entire mass of Professor Schaff's work, casting its shadow over its whole scene, and giving its form and hue to all its facts, is a fatal objection to it.

1. It is a mere delusion, a farce unworthy of a scholar, to imagine that a history written on such a basis is entitled to be regarded as "scientific." Professor Schaff and his school, indeed, who assign it that distinguishing honor, do not in fact use the term scientific, so much to denote that which is accurate and demonstrable, as simply that which is framed in conformity with a preconceived theory; whether the preconception is true or false. The systems of Schelling and Hegel are held by them to be "scientific," because they affect to account for everything by a single principle—the identity of God and the universe. But what can be more unscientific than to attempt to write a history of God and man on an *à priori* assumption, of the truth of which, apart from other objections to it, we neither have nor can have any evidences whatever? Is there any other branch of knowledge in which an arbitrary hypothesis is allowed to take the place of *fact*, and give its shape and coloring to all the subjects that fall within its sphere? It has been regarded as the distinguishing honor of the last three centuries, that that mode of procedure has been rejected, and the inductive method substituted in its place. It was reserved to the German speculatists of the present day, to discard the Baconian method to which the world is indebted for all its great achievements in science during the last three hundred years, and

return to the system of arbitrary assumption and hypothesis. The very men who have been loudest in their denunciations of the Wolfian method of spinning out systems from *à priori* assumptions, have themselves returned to that method during the last thirty or forty years, and founded on it many of their great philosophical and historical works.

2. It is a far more formidable objection, that the conception of God and of man on which the theory proceeds, is altogether false. The God of pantheism is a wholly different being from the Jehovah of the Bible: and the "humanity" of the pantheist is totally different from the actual nature of men. The God and men of Professor Schaff are the mere creations of Schelling's philosophy, not the Jehovah and the men of the Bible; and his history, so far as he adheres to his theory, instead of a history of the real church, is a mere ascription to those imaginary beings, of the events that constitute the history of the actual church. It would be regarded as a monstrous extravagance and outrage, to found a church history on the assumption that the Jehovah of the Bible is the Brahma of the Hindoos, and that the doctrines and worship of the church in all ages have been those that are peculiar to the theology and worship of that fabled deity: yet that would not be a grosser parody or perversion of the truth, than a church history is, which assumes that God and the universe are identically the same; that the sum total of men are God in a finite form; and endeavors to give to all their doctrines, worships, and acts, the shape and color of that theory.

Professor Schaff accordingly, instead of being led by his theory to a true exhibition of God, of man, and of the church, absolutely divests himself by it, of the power of verifying any of the great truths and facts in regard to them, which he professedly recognises and maintains. Thus he strenuously holds, in opposition to the Hegelian Tubingen school—that Jehovah is a personal God; and represents it as a fundamental element of Christianity, that to reject it is to plunge at once into the fathomless abyss of atheism. Yet he is obliged, directly in the teeth of his philosophy, to take that great central truth of the Bible *for granted;* to prove it, or to show the possibility of it, consistently with his theory, is impossible.

"How can the absolute be *known*? The absolute as unconditioned, identical, and one, cannot be cognised, *under* conditions, by difference and plurality. It cannot therefore be known, if the subject of knowledge be distinguished from the object of knowledge: in a knowledge of the absolute, existence and knowledge must be identical. The absolute can only be known by the absolute itself. But is this possible? We are wholly ignorant of existence in itself: the mind knows nothing except in parts, by quality, and difference and relation. Consciousness supposes the subject [the agent that thinks] contra-distinguished from the object of thought . . . and the negation of consciousness, is the annihilation [a denial] of thought itself. The alternative is therefore unavoidable—either finding the absolute we lose ourselves; or retaining self and individual consciousness, we do not reach the absolute."—Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy, Appleton's edition, pp. 461, 462.

In other words, by the terms of the theory, there is no possibility of our reaching a knowledge of God as a personal being, or an existence differing from ourselves, unless we first have a positive consciousness that instead of a differing personal being, or existence, he is *identical* with ourselves—because a consciousness of being the absolute himself is an indispensable requisite to the knowledge of the absolute.

"All this Schelling frankly admits. He admits that a knowledge of the absolute is impossible, in personalty and consciousness: he admits that as the understanding knows, and can know only by consciousness, and consciousness only by difference [a difference of the person who knows from the thing that is known], we, as conscious and understanding, can apprehend, can *conceive* only the conditioned [which is not the absolute, but the finite], and he admits that only if man be himself the infinite, can the infinite be known by him.

"But Schelling contends that there is a capacity of knowledge *above* consciousness, and higher than the understanding [which understanding is held to be the source of all the knowledge obtained through the senses and reflection], and that this knowledge is competent to human *reason*, as *identical with the absolute itself*. In this act of knowledge which after Fichte he calls the *intellectual intuition*, there exists no distinction of subject and object—no contrast of knowledge and existence [the thing known], all difference is lost in absolute indifference [identity], all plurality in absolute unity. The intuition itself—reason—*and the absolute are identified*."—Ibid., pp. 462, 463.

But this directly implies again that the Absolute is not a

personal being, distinct from the human intelligence that perceives him: for if the percipient reason, or the act of intuition, and the Absolute, the object of that intuition, are identical, then the Absolute is not a distinct and personal God: if it be, then indisputably *the percipient reason*, or the intuitive *act*, is a personal God; and then Schelling, instead of one, has as many personal Gods as there are human intelligences, or acts of intellectual intuition.

"The absolute exists only as known by reason, and reason knows only as being *itself the absolute*. This act is necessarily *ineffable*. To be known, it must be experienced. It cannot be *conceived* by the understanding, because beyond its sphere; it cannot be *described*, because its essence is identity, and all description supposes discrimination. To those who are unable to rise beyond a philosophy of reflection, Schelling candidly allows that the doctrine of the absolute can appear only a series of contradictions; . . . . [that is, if not gratuitously admitted, it must be held to be demonstrably false.] . . . .

"The *intuition* of the absolute is manifestly the work of an arbitrary abstraction, and of a self-delusive imagination. To reach the point of indifference, by abstraction, he annihilates the object; and by abstraction he annihilates the subject of consciousness. But what remains? *Nothing*. He then hypostatizes the zero, baptizes it with the name of *Absolute*, and conceits that he contemplates absolute existence, when he only *speculates* absolute *privation*. This truth has been indeed virtually confessed by the two most distinguished followers of Schelling. Hegel at last abandons the intuition, and regards '*pure or undetermined existence*' as convertible with '*pure nothing*;' whilst Oken, if he adhere to the intuition, intrepidly identifies the Deity, or Absolute, with zero. God he makes the *nothing*, the nothing he makes *God*."—Sir W. Hamilton's Phil., pp. 463, 464.

By their own showing, then, the knowledge of God as a personal being, distinct from the finite intelligences who are supposed to know him, is, on the ground of their theory, altogether impossible. Professor Schaff, therefore, has no personal God, except as he gratuitously assumes his existence against his own philosophy; he has only the finite material and psychical existences into which he holds that the Absolute has distributed himself. In all that part of his work, accordingly, in which he assumes and affirms that God is a personal being, and treats that great central truth as a fun-

damental element of Christianity, he steps out of the sphere of his philosophy, pronounces it a fatal error, and thence overturns the scheme of organic development on which he proceeds in his history. A singular exemplification truly of the "intellectual intuition," the direct "insight" of the Absolute, of which the party talk so confidently.

But he is not only without a personal God; he is equally without personal men. Mankind, on his theory, are no longer human beings, creatures, individuals, finite entities, distinct from God and one another. Instead, they are converted into God himself; are self-existent; are identical with him to the extent of their being, both as entities and as agents; are the forms in which he develops himself; and comprise in themselves all that part of his essence that is intelligent and conscious. Professor Schaff's human beings are, therefore, no more individual personal agents, creatures, finite and dependent, than his impersonal is a personal God. They are mere ideal existences, as completely out of the sphere of humanity and of fact, as the monster forms of Assyrian and Egyptian sculpture and painting, or the gods of Greek and Roman polytheism. His introduction of these pantheistic hippogriffs on to the stage of history, and ascription to them of the doctrines, faiths, worships, acts, and catastrophes of the church, is therefore a revolting farce, and involves him in endless contradictions and absurdities; for his philosophy and history are, at every step of his progress, in irreconcilable antagonism with each other, and the facts of the church are recognised by him in their true character, only as he surrenders the principles of his theory.

Thus, notwithstanding his philosophy, he everywhere assumes that men are in fact human beings, creatures, finite, dependent, and fallen; that they are sinners; that they are exposed to punishment; that they need redemption; that an expiation has been made for them by Christ, and that salvation is proffered to them through him; yet how these facts are reconcilable with his pantheism he makes no attempt to show. He coolly takes them for granted, as though they offered no contradiction to the doctrines of his theory. But that they are possible or even conceivable on the ground of pantheism, neither Schelling, Hegel, nor any of their disciples has ever proved.

"Nor does the negative chimera prove less fruitful than the positive; for Schelling has found it as difficult to evolve *the one into the many*, as his disciples to deduce the universe and its contents from the first self-affirmation of the primordial nothing.

> Miri homines! *Nihil* esse aliquid statuantve negentve;
> Quodque negant statuunt, quod statuuntque negant.

"To Schelling, indeed, it has been impossible, without gratuitous and even contradictory assumptions, to explain the deduction of *the finite* from the infinite. By no *salto mortale* has he been able to clear the magic circle in which he had inclosed himself. Unable to connect the unconditioned and the conditioned by any natural correlation, he has variously attempted to account for the phenomenon of the universe, either by imposing a necessity of self-manifestation on the absolute, *i. e.* by conditioning the unconditioned; or *by postulating a fall of the finite from the infinite*, i. e. *begging the very fact which his hypothesis professed its exclusive ability to explain.*"—Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy, p. 465.

He talks of the fall of man, indeed, as a disunion of the human will from the divine will; a separation of Adam from God, and an attempt at an independent and extra divine existence. But it is a mere assumption, not only destitute of proof, but irreconcilable with his theory. If, as he maintains, men are identical with God himself—the mere forms in which he unfolds himself, and thence all their thoughts, affections, and acts are his, it is plainly impossible that they can apostatize from him, and become his enemies. By the supposition, as their acts are his acts, not the acts of differing and subordinate agents, it would be an apostasy from himself, which is absurd. It is impossible, also, from the consideration that, according to the theory, there is no personal God, and thence no lawgiver, and therefore no external law that can be broken by a fall, and consequently no divine will from which the human will can separate itself. By the terms of the theory there are no acts of divine intelligence but the acts of finite intelligences, in whom alone God, the scheme represents, is conscious, and acts as an intelligent and free agent. How, then, can there be a transgression without any law to transgress; or a fall from God, without a God to fall from? Can anything be more absurd and self-contradictious than the fancy that man and God being identical,

men can fall from him, and he nevertheless remain unfallen? that their reason, their will, and their acts, being altogether his, as absolutely as according to the theory their essence and being are, their reason and their will can yet fall from his, and his reason and will, nevertheless, though identically the same as theirs, still remain unfallen?

On the ground of the theory, then, it is clearly impossible that men can revolt from God, become sinners, and need a redemption; and equally impossible that God can have provided a redemption for them. Professor Schaff accordingly gratuitously assumes all these great facts and truths of the Christian system, in the teeth of his philosophy which exhibits them as impossible; and involves himself consequently in the most bald and fatal contradictions.

3. As the other great facts and doctrines of the Christian system are also precluded by his theory; in recognising and treating them as realities, as he does explicitly in many passages, he, in like manner, assumes them, in spite of his philosophy; and, without any pretence of reconciling them, frames his history as though the two systems were in harmony with each other.

Thus, according to his theory, there is no Trinity of persons in the Godhead. There is, indeed, as we have shown, no personal God whatever. The doctrine of the system is, that God has no consciousness or intelligence, except as he developes himself in the form of men. As the Absolute, he is an impersonal and unconscious substance or essence, acting and unfolding itself by a blind physical necessity. A Trinity of persons is accordingly rejected by the great authors and propagators of the system, and a triad of modes of development, agencies, or relations substituted in their place. Thus, Schleiermacher held that the Trinity is a mere threefoldness of manifestation. Schelling exhibits it as what he denominates three potencies: 1, the Absolute, or the impersonal Divine essence; 2, the Divine essence developed in the material and psychical universe; and, 3, the consciousness of the identity of the two. That is the doctrine also of Coleridge and of Bunsen, as is seen in passages quoted in our last number (pp. 360, 361), in which the latter presents this triad as an exponent of God, the Word, and the Spirit. He gives also, as another definition of them, God, Man, and

Humanity. According to the theory, therefore, the Eternal Word, the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit, are not persons of the Trinity. There, in truth, is no personal God whatever. Yet in the face of this fact—undisguised, notorious, openly avowed by the great authors and disciples of the system—Professor Schaff, without any indication of his reasons, without a hint that any explanation of his course can be thought necessary, speaks of the Son of God, of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, as persons of the Trinity in the sense of the Confessions and the New Testament; and no one, not aware of his philosophy, would suppose that that is not his genuine faith. In this exhibition, therefore, he quits the ground of his pantheism, and assumes that the doctrine of the New Testament respecting the persons of the Godhead is true, and involves himself thereby in the most glaring self-contradiction. How is this to be accounted for? As he is perfectly aware that Schleiermacher, Schelling, Hegel, and their followers reject the doctrine of a personal Trinity, and substitute a wholly different triad in its place, and that in adopting their pantheism, he must naturally be presumed to hold that inseparable part of it; why, if it is not an ingredient of his own theory, does he not formally apprise his readers of it? If he does not regard it as a genuine element of his philosophy, if he is able to show that the scriptural doctrine of the personal Trinity is consistent with his pantheism, and one of its essential ingredients, why has he not pointed out the mode in which it is reconcilable with the doctrine of the Scriptures, and protected himself from the objection to which he is now exposed? As he has made no attempt to remove or veil their palpable antagonism, we are left to conclude, either that he has forgotten his philosophy, or else that, feeling himself unable to carry out its principles, he has chosen tacitly to quit it, and, in order to lead on his readers, and to give an air of orthodoxy to his work, assumed that those great doctrines of the Christian system are true, though they are irreconcilable with his pantheism.

In like manner, the expiation of sin by Christ's death, regeneration by the Holy Ghost, and justification by grace, are, on the ground of the theory, impossible. If Christ is not a Divine being in any higher sense than any other individual of the human race; if there is no personal God, no

lawgiver, therefore, and consequently no law, and thence no sin, how can Christ's death be an expiation for sin? How can it fill such an impossible office any more than the death of any other person? If men are God in finite forms, how can they be supposed to need regeneration? If the Holy Spirit is not a person, but a mere consciousness of the identity of the Absolute and the material and psychical universe, how can it be supposed to regenerate men? And finally, if men are God, in finite forms, and their acts and affections are his, how can it be believed that they need to be justified by grace? Whose grace is it that is to justify them; and from what is it that they are to be justified? All these important branches of the work of redemption are plainly impossible on the ground of the theory. Yet Professor Schaff recognises and treats them as essential elements of the Christian system, and without any attempt to show how they consist with his philosophy. He quits his pantheism, in short, as before, without notifying his readers of it, and passes into the sphere of fact and truth as they are presented in the New Testament, and thereby introduces into his history two antagonistic and mutually destructive forces. If his philosophy is true, the evangelical doctrines which he recognises are not. If those doctrines are true, his philosophy is not. It is equally clear, also, on the ground of pantheism, that there can be no specific, authoritative revelation from God. How, if there be no personal God, can there be a revelation from such a being? How, if there be no lawgiver, can there be a law that is enacted by one? If all the thoughts and acts of men are the thoughts and acts of God, if each individual of the race is, equally with every other, God in a finite form, how can the thoughts and acts of any one or any number of them be any more a revelation of his will, or any more authoritative, than any other? They plainly cannot. They must all stand on the same level as to divinity and authority. All the great advocates of this pantheism, accordingly, Schleiermacher, Schelling, Hegel, Neander, Coleridge, Bunsen, deny that the Scriptures are an inspired revelation from God, and hold them as of very little more authority than other ancient writings of upright and well meaning, but imperfect men. Professor Schaff, however, treats them as the work of genuine inspiration, and an authoritative rule

to believers; calling "the Bible the store-house of Divine revelation, and the infallible rule of faith and practice for the church." How this is reconcilable with his pantheism, or his theory of organic development, he neglects, however, to show. If there is no personal God, it is certain that there cannot be a revelation from one. If the Bible is the infallible rule of faith to the church in all ages, it is clear that his theory of development, which represents that the thoughts, beliefs, worships, and acts of the church, at every stage of its progress, are the true exponents of Christianity at their several periods, cannot be true: and if the faith, worship, and acts of the church, at every period, are a true expression and index of Christianity at their several periods, it is certain that the Bible does not present a true picture of Christianity, and cannot be an infallible rule of faith for the church in all ages. In this recognition of the Scriptures as the Word of God, he thus quits again the ground of his theory, and passes to that of the Bible, and accordingly arrays himself as an historian in opposition to himself as a philosopher.

4. Notwithstanding the recognition of the Scriptures as the Word of God, he neglects, warps, or sets them aside, just in proportion as he adheres to his theory that Christianity is a progressive and perpetually developing system of doctrines, rites, worship, and acts; and that the faith, homage, and practice of the church at each period, is a true exponent of genuine Christianity at that period. This is seen in his denial that the Catholic is an apostate church, and exhibition of some of its false doctrines, superstitious rites, unjust assumptions of authority, and unpardonable tyrannies, as the genuine outgrowths of the original Christian germ, and as legitimate and essential parts of its stock and branches as any other. And this is characteristic of the school to which he belongs; and reveals itself, not only in the direct justification of Roman errors, but in the ridicule and depreciation of the Protestant doctrine, that the Bible is to be taken as the unalterable and infallible guide of faith. And this effect of his principles will doubtless become more and more conspicuous as he recedes from the age of the apostles, and treats of the period when, as he holds, the great law of organic development came to exert its full power on the

church, and gave new shapes and hues to its doctrines, worship, and practice.

5. His doctrine of organic development implies that all the doctrines, the idolatries, the superstitions, and the profligate and impious acts of the church in every age, are the outgrowths of primitive Christianity; that Christianity changes, therefore, as the faith and practice of the church change; and that the writings of the Fathers and others of the several periods, as far as they present a true picture of the principles and life of the church of their times, present as just and authoritative an account of Christianity at those stages of its development as the New Testament presents of it at its first institution. If, according to this theory, all that takes place in the church is a development of Christianity; and if all which it ever unfolds continues to be an element of it in every subsequent stage of its progress, then, indisputably, the errors, idolatries, superstitions, and enormities, of every description, of the age of Gregory the Great, of Hildebrand, of Innocent III., of Alexander VI., of Leo X., and of Pius V., were as truly substantive parts of Christianity at those periods, as the doctrines, faith, worship, and laws of the church of the apostles as they are exhibited in the New Testament, were substantive parts of Christianity at its original institution. To this, however, he does not adhere. Instead, he admits that the Catholic, the Greek, and the Protestant churches have fallen into many great errors:—so numerous and great, that he regards a new reformation as necessary to bring them to the platform of his philosophical Christianity. How this is to be reconciled with his doctrine of development, he does not show; as in other cases, he passes off the two contradictory representations without a hint that they are in antagonism with each other. Nor could he have reconciled them had he attempted it. For how, on his theory of organic evolution, is he to prove that any given doctrine, worship, or practice of the Roman, Greek, or Protestant church is erroneous? If he appeals to the Scriptures as an authoritative and perfect exponent of Christian truth, and rejects a doctrine or practice because it is inconsistent with their teachings, then he, in effect, abandons his theory of development, and assumes that Christianity does not and cannot change. If he rejects

a dogma, rite, or custom because the Bible neither directly teaches it nor presents any trace of it, then he relinquishes his theory that all changes that take place in the faith and practice of the church are *organic*, constitutional, and legitimate, instead of being, if evil, like all other errors and sins, the result of evil principles, passions, or external influences. If, on the other hand, he gives up the Bible as an infallible rule of faith and duty, and adheres to his theory of development, then he has no means of proving that any doctrine, rite, or act of the church, of any age, is not a genuine doctrine, rite, or practice of Christianity in that age. His principles compel him to regard every change that takes place in the faith or practice of the church as organic; as an evolution of Christianity itself; and, therefore, as integral an element of the Christian religion at that stage of its development, as any of the other doctrines, rites, or laws are that belong to its nature.

6. He accordingly openly maintains that the Catholic is not only a true church, but is emphatically *the* Christian church; recognises the primacy of Rome and of the pope; and holds that it is by that apostate communion that Christianity has, by the organic process, come down to our age.

"The ultra-Protestant view decidedly repudiates the idea of the permanent primacy, and denies the papacy the least Scriptural ground or Divine right. It accordingly denounces this system as the most colossal and barefaced lie known to history, and applies to it, in fact, the predictions of the New Testament concerning Antichrist and the 'Man of Sin,' who 'opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.' To this extreme view, however, *we cannot at all agree. It not only turns* ALL HISTORY *before the Reformation into an inextricable labyrinth*, but *gives the lie to the Lord's precious promise to be and rule in his church continually;* for it is an absolute impossibility *to make out an unbroken perpetuity of Christianity without the Catholic church;* nay, plays mightily, in its results,—without willing or knowing it,—into the hands of scepticism and infidelity. No! In the face of a history of eighteen hundred years, during which the papacy has really evinced something of a rock-like character; in the face of the clear testimonies of almost all of the important church Fathers, both Greek and Latin, in favor of a peculiar pre-eminence of the Roman See, as the continuation of the *cathedra Petri* in some form; in view of the consistency and tenacity with which the Catholic church has, at all times, held fast all the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the

Trinity, the true Divinity and humanity of Christ, the inspiration and Divine authority of the Bible (all of which anti-christianity denies); in view of the great merits of the popes in maintaining orthodoxy, asserting the unity, freedom, and independence of the church against the assaults of the secular power, upholding the sanctity of marriage, and especially spreading Christianity and civilization among all the Romanic, Germanic, and Scandinavian nations,—in view of all these facts, which are coming more and more to be conceded by unprejudiced Protestant historians, *we cannot possibly question that the Roman church*, HOWEVER CORRUPT *in many doctrines and practices, belongs to* THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY ITSELF, *and that it must accordingly have also some ground even in the Holy Scriptures.* Nay, we believe that even since the Reformation, *the Pope as such*, THAT IS, IN HIS OFFICIAL CHARACTER, IS NOT ANTICHRIST, *but the legitimate head of the Roman church*, which, however, is certainly not, as she herself arrogantly asserts, identical with the Catholic or universal church, but simply, like Greek or Protestant Christendom, a part of it.' "—Note, pp. 375, 376.

He thus openly places his recognition of the Catholic communion as a true church, and the pope as its legitimate head, and his denial that it is the Babylon of the Apocalypse, *on the ground of his theory of organic development.* The simple fact that a church has existed at Rome from the age of the apostles, and has been at its several stages what it has, in doctrine, rites, organization, practice, and influence, is alleged by him as demonstrating that it is now, and has been at every past stage of its history, a true church, and "*belongs to the historical development of Christianity itself.*" But if the mere fact that it has thus existed and been what it has, is a proof that it is a true church, and that the various changes through which it has passed of doctrines, worship, government, and agency, are organic developments of "Christianity itself;" then most certainly all its doctrines, worships, superstitions, immoralities, usurpations, and tyrannies, are organic developments of Christianity itself. There is no escape from this conclusion. What is it that has been historically developed in its history, if it be not the changes of doctrine, worship, principle, government, and practice through which it has passed? It were absurd to call its continuing to hold the doctrines of "the Trinity, the divinity and humanity of Christ, and the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible," —which were specific articles of its faith in the age of the apostles—an organic and historical development. Organic

developments are outgrowths, unfoldings, new forms springing from the original germ; not that germ itself remaining unaltered. As, then, the modifications and new forms that have come into existence constitute the developments that have taken place in the church; if the church "belongs," from the fact of its existence, to "the historical development of Christianity itself," then all the modifications through which it has passed assuredly belong to that development. Professor Schaff can no more make an exception of idolatry, the invocation of saints, the mass, indulgences, immorality, tyranny, persecution, than he can of any other element of her creed, her worship, or her practice. And this is the result to which his system tends. The passionate protests in which he occasionally indulges against some of the errors of Romanism and Puseyism, will go for little while he holds the theory of development. Romanists will ask no more comprehensive concession than that theory makes, to justify the whole of their idolatries, superstitions, immoralities, and tyrannies. Nor will those who adopt his philosophy, if consistent with their principles, need anything further to convert them into the most blind and unquestioning adherents of the pope.

7. According to his theory, no such idolatrous, profligate, and bloody power as the Babylon of the Apocalypse ever has or ever can arise in the church. The representations of that, and the parallel prophecies of the Bible, are in effect set aside as mistaken or misunderstood. All the doctrines that rise in the church, all the principles that gain a place in it, all that it teaches, and all that it does, are "developments of Christianity itself;" never perversions of it by a hostile power; never insertions on the stock of its genuine truths of foreign elements drawn from old paganism, or a false philosophy, and yielding a poisonous, instead of a healthful and life-giving fruit. How can Protestantism then be justified? It plainly cannot, consistently; and in fact it is not. He holds indeed, that it is a process of organic development; yet in the teeth of that representation he treats it as an extravagance that needs a reformation as urgently as the Catholicism of the age in which it sprang into existence did.

8. He accordingly holds that another great revolution is at hand, in which Catholicism and Protestantism are to be

united, and Christianity by their fusion
perfect form. The primacy of Rome
the pope, he of course holds are to rem
ments into its new phase; as he expr
as belonging to its genuine historica
asserts that whatever "has once come t
weight, must ever incorporate itself as a
the subsequent part of the process." T
philosophy, however, or in the present
justify the expectation of such a revo
tendency in Europe now is, to the fall
the restoration of Romanism to its ancie
formed in doctrine, worship, spirit, or
the clearest teachings also, of the Script
in the most emphatic manner, that the
fligate, and persecuting power, that ha
name of Christ's church, and employed
and destroying the nations, is to carr
witnesses of Jesus to the last, and is at
verted, but to be struck from existen
of man and God; and that the pop
instead of retaining his usurped throne
vicegerent of Christ, is to be seized an
lake of fire and brimstone, as a prelimi
to the redemption of the world from the
the establishment of Christ's kingdom
perfection and glory.

Such are the great principles on wh
founds his history, and such are the do
make it the vehicle of inculcating. Ba
absurd philosophy, which contemplate
work of redemption as wholly different
and attempting to apply that philoso
the human race, and the redemption of
it is in utter antagonism, he runs contin
est inconsistencies as he vibrates from
Bible and the facts of history; or from
and the Bible, to his philosophy.
characteristic of his work, accordingly, i
one of these spheres to the other, and
futations. All its true pictures; all it
all its noblest passages, are written o

Bible, fact, and common sense, and are the antipodes, therefore, of his pantheistic and development theory. Let the reader turn to pp. 283, 285, 298, 299, 301, 302, 304, 305, 327, note, in which he declares it a fundamental mistake in Baur's "construction of history," that it makes error the source of truth, darkness the mother of light; whereas," he asserts, "the very reverse is the fact—that heresy arises only in opposition to truth already substantially present, and borrows from this truth its best weapons,"—propositions that cannot possibly be true, if his theory of organic development be correct—361, 514. Not one of these pages could have been written on the ground of his pantheism and theory of development. It was only by losing sight of his philosophy, and allowing fact and common sense to resume their dominion over him, that he was able to pen them. And so of a crowd of others. On the other hand, his obscure, cant, mystical, anti-scriptural, and Romanizing passages, are all written on the ground of his philosophy. And finally, the effect of his work—like the speculations of Dr. Nevin, whom he endorses and applauds—will, as far as its influence accords with its principles, be to spread the pantheistic philosophy which he makes its basis, to aid the diffusion of Roman Catholicism, and to misrepresent and discredit the Protestant faith. We greatly regret that this is its character. If Professor Schaff would discard the false and impious speculations of his countrymen, by which he is beguiled, and write his history on the basis of the Bible, of man, and of fact, he might make it, not merely a respectable and useful, but a very valuable work, and entitle himself to the high respect and gratitude of the church. As it is, it is not only unworthy of the subject, but of his talents and learning, and undeserving of the patronage of the friends of religion.

Art. VII.—Literary and Critical Notices.

1. The Premium Essay, on the Characteristics and Laws of Prophetic Symbols. By the Rev. Edward Winthrop, A.M., Rector of St. Paul's church, Norwalk, Ohio. New York: Franklin Knight, 140 Nassau street. 1854.

This is the Essay to which the premium was awarded on the question whether "the Views of the Characteristics and Laws of Pro-

phetic Symbolization, presented in the Theological and Literary Journal," are true or not. It gives an affirmative answer to that question, and supports it with the most ample demonstration. All the main topics are treated that are enumerated in the proposal for the Essay; the nature and office of symbols; the marks by which the symbolic prophecies are distinguished from others; their laws; the revelation of these laws in the inspired interpretations that are given of a portion of the symbols; the results to which they lead; and the duty of interpreters to take them as their guide in the exposition of the symbolic prophecies. It is written in a very clear style, with great directness, and with a certainty and amplitude of proof, which no candid mind, we think, will find it easy to resist. There is no point in the whole sphere of interpretation, less open, we believe, to reasonable debate, than that the laws of prophetic symbols are those which have been presented in the Journal; that they are revealed by the inspiring Spirit in the prophecies themselves; that they are of divine authority, and that interpreters are bound to observe them in their exposition of the symbols. And this conviction is spreading. It is known to us that a large number of ministers in the different evangelical denominations have become satisfied of their truth. A still greater number have become convinced that the current method of treating the symbols as mere figures, or as used without any intelligible law, must be given up as unauthorized, unscholarly, and robbing them of their true meaning; and are gradually advancing to the adoption of the principles maintained in this Essay. The number of those who are disposed to read on the subject is rapidly increasing; the extraordinary occurrences and indications of providence have raised the feeling in thousands that the notions of the future which are generally entertained, instead of being verified, are likely to be confuted and swept away by the next great catastrophe in Europe; and that a re-examination of the subject is indispensable. To such we earnestly recommend the perusal of this Essay. They will find it no weak, hypothetical, or imaginative work, made up of groundless assumptions or arbitrary assertions. It is *an argument*, and not merely clear, direct, scriptural, and demonstrative, but marked by these qualities in an unusual degree. However the false-believing and prejudiced may remain unaffected by it, men of sense and learning, the ingenuous, the upright, who desire to understand the word of God, we think, will not. They will read it with interest; they will be impressed with a deep conviction of the truth and importance of the principles which it advocates; and they will welcome it as a most timely and valuable auxiliary in the interpretation of the Prophetic Scriptures.

2. PHILOSOPHY OF SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON, BART., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in Edinburgh University. Arranged and edited by O. W. Wight, for the use of Schools and Academies. New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1853.

SIR W. HAMILTON'S principal metaphysical treatises, originally published in the form of Notes and Dissertations in his edition of Dr. Reid's writings, or of independent Discussions on Philosophy, are united in this volume, and so arranged as to give them the air of a systematic work; and they form a nobler contribution than any other of the age, to that branch of learning. He treats in the first part, of "The Philosophy of Common Sense, or our primary beliefs considered as the ultimate criterion of Truth," in which he establishes the doctrine of Reid, that the convictions to which our nature universally and resistlessly carries us, such as that we exist, and that the objects which we perceive by our senses exist without us, must be taken as expressive of facts; and with a keenness of analysis, and force and beauty of logic that are unsurpassed, confutes the scepticism of Hume, and the idealism of Berkeley, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. In the second part, on the Philosophy of Perception, besides presenting his own views, he states the various theories that have prevailed on the subject, and points out their errors. In this division his searching criticism of a portion of the late Dr. Thomas Brown's Lectures, which first appeared in the Edinburgh Review, is introduced. The third part, on the Philosophy of the Conditioned, is devoted chiefly to the confutation of Cousin's doctrine of the Infinito-Absolute. The work is marked throughout by vast research, the most comprehensive and thorough learning, the finest powers of discrimination and reasoning, an unbiassed judgment, and a noble love of truth. It gives a fuller conspectus of the views that have been entertained by philosophers generally of the subjects of which it treats, than any other we have seen. It has the rare merit of consistency with the great doctrines of revealed religion. It presents a simple and more effective confutation of the sceptical and atheistic metaphysics that are now in the ascendant, than we have met in any other writer; and, though dealing with very abstruse themes, generally presents them with precision and clearness. As a text book in the hands of competent teachers in schools, academies, and colleges, it will prove more useful as a barrier to the false philosophies that are now current, than any other volume that has lately issued from the press.

3. NOTES, CRITICAL, ILLUSTRATIVE, AND PRACTICAL, ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL, WITH AN INTRODUCTORY DISSERTATION. By Albert Barnes. New York: Leavitt and Allen. 1853.

IN the Introduction, Mr. Barnes treats at large of the genuineness

4. The Hand of God in History: or Divine Providence Historically Illustrated in the Extension and Establishment of Christianity. By Hollis Reid, A.M. Hartford: H. E. Robins and Co. 1853.

The author's aim is to show that many of the great and extraordinary events of past ages have been made to subserve the spread of Christianity and the well-being of the church. Those of modern times alleged by him, are chiefly the discovery of the magnetic power of the needle; the invention of printing; the manufacture of paper; the discovery of this western world; the Reformation; the migration of the Puritans to New England; the institution of missions; the establishment of societies for the diffusion of the Scriptures and other religious objects; the rapid improvement of the arts; the present condition of the Catholic, Mahometan, and Pagan nations; and the success which has attended the missions that have been established among them. These occurrences he regards as indicating that all the false religions are speedily to be swept away, and the nations universally converted,—and by the means which are now employed for the purpose. That very momentous changes are soon to take place in the religious as well as the political condition of the world, has become a general opinion; but the Scriptures clearly foreshow that those immediately at hand are not to be of the cast Mr. Reid anticipates. "When Christ cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" Undoubtedly not. Instead of a believing, it is, at least on a vast scale, to be an infidel world, and the current throughout Christendom is now beyond all doubt setting with a portentous power and rapidity in that direction. Through Europe, infidelity not only prevails among the higher classes, but has gone down through all the lower ranks, and has generated among them a restless and malignant spirit, kindred to that with which the French were inflamed at the period of the revolution. The disbelief of revelation is rapidly spreading also here. The issue of the conflict, accordingly, that is now waging, and advancing to its catastrophe, is to be, not a victory of the truth, but the conquest and slaughter by the anti-christian powers of the witnesses who proclaim it. In place of the world being converted by the church, the church and Christianity are to be saved by the personal and public interposition of Christ from extinction by their powerful and triumphant enemies. This, however, does not diminish the duty, or the inducement to continue and augment the efforts that are making to maintain and spread the gospel. Instead, it enhances them. It is by such means that the church is to be prevented from being swallowed up in the gulf of the false and atheistic philosophies that prevail: it is by such

strenuous efforts, and the greater and more believing exertions that are yet to be made, that the witnesses of Jesus are to be raised up and fitted for their hazardous office.

The work, though faulty in this respect, presents much interesting information respecting the history and present condition of the missions to the distant nations; it is written in an earnest spirit, and it has met, we perceive, a very flattering reception from the public—the present issue being the fifteenth thousand.

5. The Epistle to the Romans, in Greek and English, with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary. By S. H. Turner, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation, in the Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church. New York; Stanford & Swords. 1853.

Dr. Turner is justly ranked among the most respectable Biblical scholars in our country. His works are marked by erudition, sound sense, freedom from extreme opinions, and a sincere attachment to the great doctrines of redemption; and they are the characteristics of this volume. After a brief introduction on Paul's mental peculiarities and history, and the origin and condition of the church at Rome, he presents an extended analysis of the several divisions of the Epistle. The comment, the main object of which is to give the grammatical sense of the text, is brief. He enters into no long arguments to deduce or defend a peculiar doctrinal system, or confute the constructions of other commentators which he rejects. It is copious enough, however, to give the import of the terms and explain the nature of the reasoning; and is adapted to the use of ordinary readers as well as those who are in the sacred profession.

6. The Pilgrim's Progress, delivered under the similitude of a dream, by John Bunyan; with an Introduction, Notes, and a Sketch of the Author's life, by Stephen B. Wickens. New York. Lane & Scott. 1854.

A very tasteful edition of this religious classic, adorned with a portrait of Bunyan, and a number of cuts.

INDEX.

A

Apocalypse, S. Bliss on, 166. Barnes on, 33.
Apostolic Church, Schaff's history of, 665.
Atonement, E. C. Wines on, 404.

B

Barnes's Notes on Apocalypse, 33, 380. On Daniel, 703.
Beecher, E., Conflict of Ages, 580.
Bliss, S., on Apocalypse, 166. Memoirs of W. Miller, 169.
Bungener, L., Priest and Huguenot, 640.
Bunsen, C. C. J. on Hippolytus, 353.
Burrowes, G. on Song of Solomon, 352.
Bryant, A. on the World to Come, 527.

C

Cannon, J. S. on Pastoral Theology, 174.
Carleton, H. on Apocalypse, 33, 380.
Characteristics and Laws of Symbolization, Essay on, 701.
Christianity. Distaste for it, 99.
Christ's Second Coming, 419, 529.
Commentaries on the Laws of the Hebrews, 223.
Commentary on Romans, Turner's, 704.
Conflict of Ages, Beecher's, 580.

D

Daniel, Barnes's Notes on, 703.
Development, Nevin and Schaff on, 146.
Dickinson, R. W. on Infidelity, 620.

E

English Universities, Fowler on, 111.

F

Faith, Eclipse of, 279.
False Teachers, their character and doom, 193.
Figures of Isaiah, 321, 479.
Forsyth, J. Jun. on Song of Solomon, 494.
Fowler, W. C. on English Universities, 111.
Faber, G. S. on French Emperorship, 301.

G

Geological Theory of J. P. Smith, 33.
Gospel a Witness, J. Richards on, 558.

H

Hall, J. W. on the Inspiration of the Scriptures, 459.
Hamilton, Sir W., Philosophy, 702.
Hebrews, S. H. Turner on, 175.
Hengstenberg on Song of Solomon, 494.
Hippolytus, Bunsen on, 353.
History of Apostolic church, Schaff's, 665.
History of the Reformation, Merle's, 176.

I

Illustrations of the Bible, Kitto's, 527.
Infidelity, Pearson on, 620.
Inspiration of the Scriptures, J. W. Hall on, 459.

K

Kitto's Illustrations of the Bible, 527.

L

Letters to a Millenarian, Williamson's, 177.
Lord, E. on the Messiah in Moses, 168.
Lord, N., Discourse, 344.

M

Melville H., Lectures, 351.
Merle's History of the Reformation, 176.
Messiah in Moses and the Prophets, 160.
Miller, W., Memoirs of, 169.
Millenarian, Letters to, 177.
Millenarianism, Princeton Review on, 53. Presbyterian Quarterly on, 237.
Morals, Mercantile, Van Doren on, 215.

N

Nevin, J. W. on Development, 146.

P

Pantheism, J. W. Nevin's Theory, of 146. Bunsen's, 353. Schaff's, 665.
Pastoral Theology, Cannon on, 174.
Pearson on Infidelity, 620.
Periodicals, British, 336, 516.
Persecutions of Protestants, 640.
Philosophy, Sir W. Hamilton's, 702.
Pilgrim's Progress, Bunyan's, 704.
Pond, E. on Commentaries on Hebrew Laws, 223.
Potts, G. Address, 267.
Premium Essay, Winthrop's, 701.
Priest and Huguenot, Bungener's, 640.
Prophecy, Turner's Lectures on, 348.

R

Reid, H. on the hand of God in History, 704.
Richards, J. on the Gospel a witness, 558.
Rogers' Reason and Faith, 171.

S

Schaff's History of the Apostolic Church, 665.
Smith, J. P. on Geology, 33.
Smith, E. D. on Christianity, 99.
Song of Solomon, Burrowes on, 312. Forsyth on, 494.
Symbols of Sixth Vial, 329.
Symbolization, Laws of, 701.

T

Turkish Empire, Fall of, 507.
Turner, S. H. on Hebrews, 175; on Prophecy, 348; on Romans, 704.

V

Van Doren, W. H. on Mercantile Morals, 215.

W

Wines, E. C. on the Laws of the Hebrews, 223; on the Atonement, 404.
Winthrop, E. Premium Essay, 701.
World to Come, Bryant on, 527.